A U M

The human soul is independent, indivisible, without beginning or end. It migrateth from one body to another. Those who are in all respects free see the Lord; those who are lower abide in the Heavens, and those who are still lower go from one elemental body to another.—*Book of Shet Sasan the First: Desatir.*

# THEOSOPHY

Vol. IV OCTOBER, 1916 No. 12

*No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.*

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

## THE BHAGAVAD-GITA

### CHAPTER XIV.

### DEVOTION BY MEANS OF SEPARATION FROM THE THREE QUALITIES.

BY A STUDENT OF W. Q. J.

THIS chapter, like all the chapters in the Gita, speaks of but one Supreme devotion, to which all other forms of human devotion must eventually give way, as the pilgrim strives for perfection.

"The great Brahma", here refers to *prakriti,* matter or nature, for matter or nature is the cause of all action throughout the universe, as it is the basis by which action may take place. There can be no action unless there is something to be acted upon, hence, spirit and substance are held to be without beginning, that is, co-eternal and co-existent.

As there are great periods of non-manifestation as well as of manifestation, so for Spirit or Consciousness, and Substance or matter, there must be periods of latency and periods of activity which are synchronous with each other.

Prakriti or substance is "the womb" in which the Self or Spirit places "the seed" of thought or idea; from this, action and evolution begin.

The following classification and discussion of the three qualities illustrates the vital difference between the ancient, true psychology of the East, and what is termed Western psychology. Both abound in classifications; those of the East are much more

numerous than those of the West and cover a far wider field; Western psychology in its classifications refers solely to mental states. The psychology of the Gita and the ancient sages classifies the *moral* states, treating the mental states as mere effects produced by moral conditions. Herein lies the secret of the hold the Gita has had all down the ages, and continues to have increasingly. It lays bare unsuspected bases of error; it discloses the most subtle forms of self-delusion; it marks out the true course so painstakingly that the dullest mind cannot fail to grasp a clear perception of the path to true knowledge.

"The three great qualities called *sattva, rajas,* and *tamas*—light, or truth; passion or desire; and indifference or darkness—are *born from nature,* and bind the imperishable soul to the body. The binding is by the attachment of the self or soul to the qualities perceived in nature. The *sattva* quality binds to rebirth through attachment to knowledge and that which is pleasant; the fruit of righteous acts appertains to *sattva.*

*Rajas* is of the nature of desire, producing thirst and propensity; it binds the soul through action and its consequences. Being separative and compelling in quality, its fruit is gathered in pain.

*Tamas* is of the nature of indifference or darkness; as the chapter states, it is the deluder of all creatures; it imprisoneth the Ego in a body through heedless folly, sleep and idleness; ignorance, delusion and folly exist where *tamas* prevails.

Every human being is attached to physical existence through these qualities; it must not be supposed, however, that one of these qualities is present in one individual and absent in others, for all three qualities belong to nature and are participated in by every living being. The differences in human beings are found in the degrees of attraction which each one has for one or other of the qualities. As the chapter recites, "when tamas and rajas are overcome, then sattva prevaileth"; "when sattva and tamas are hidden, then rajas prevaileth"; "when sattva and rajas diminish, then tamas is chiefly acting".

Once the student understands the nature of these three qualities or attractions found in physical existence, he is prepared to examine his own disposition in regard to them. Has he clearness of perception? Is he of a quiet and peaceful nature? Is he attached to knowledge and that which is pleasant? If so, the quality of Sattva is there to some degree, even if only for the time being. To the individual, Sattva is that which seems good to him, even though his prevailing quality be Rajas or Tamas; so the bee seeks and appreciates the sweetness in the flower, but is ignorant of the flower's nature or purpose. While every form in the three kingdoms of nature has its own peculiar quality, whether consciously or unconsciously expressed, yet the perceptions of these qualities depend upon the nature of the perceiver, his under-

standing and knowledge. Good and evil are relative; Nature may not be classified as part good and part bad. The goodness, the passion and desire, the ignorance, indifference and folly are in ourselves. The path to Sattvic perception and perfection begins with the feeling of responsibility for thought, word and deed, and ends in unselfishness.

The characteristics of Rajas are love of gain, activity in action—meaning the holding of external action as the end in view; the initiating of works; restlessness and inordinate desire, producing thirst and propensity for possessions of any and every kind; loudness of speech; obtrusiveness in manner and action, and self-assertion in many ways.

Tamas shows itself in "indifference or darkness", as the chapter notes. Here it would seem that "indifference" and "darkness" are synonymous terms; for that which we call indifference arises from ignorance of the true nature of things, events, and beings; it might be called the selfishness of ignorance. There are, of course, many degrees of Tamas, as many in fact as there are minds, for Tamas is indicated wherever there is ignorance, folly, idleness, and delusion in any degree.

Thus one may express Sattvic-Rajasic or Sattvic-Tamasic qualities; Rajasic-Tamasic or Rajasic-Sattvic; Tamasic-Sattvic or Tamasic-Rajasic, in variable and varying degrees at different times according as one is carried away by personal feeling.

Even Sattva may be of that kind which expresses a harmless selfishness; the love of knowledge, of goodness and pleasantness for one's own sake, or the doing of righteous acts for the reward which follows them; while these bring a fair and pleasant existence, the results obtained from them are temporary, and at the same time bind one to physical existence.

The highest path, and that which leads to emancipation, is "separation from the three qualities". Of course, there is in reality no separation possible in the ordinary sense of the word; "separation" here means non-identification. It is Ahankara, self-identifying attachment with the ever-changing forms, conditions and relations of physical existence that makes the real "separation" and binds men to re-birth in a world, which they make one of infinitely more suffering than of joy. "He, O son of Pandu, who doth not hate these qualities—illumination, action and delusion—when they appear, nor longeth for them when they disappear; who, like one who is of no party, sitteth as one unconcerned about the three qualities and undisturbed by them, who being persuaded that the three qualities exist, is not moved by them; who is of equal mind in pain and pleasure, . . with those who like or dislike . . the same whether praised or blamed; equally minded in honor or disgrace; the same toward friendly or unfriendly side, engaging only in necessary actions, such an one hath surmounted the qualities."

# TRANSACTIANS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

## OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

## DISCUSSIONS OF THE STANZAS OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF "THE SECRET DOCTRINE."

*(Continued from September)*

The "Transactions" were compiled from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, January 10th to June 20th, 1889, and later printed in pamphlet form. Copies of this pamphlet are getting rarer with every year. THEOSOPHY is therefore reprinting the "Transactions" for the benefit of present-day students. The answers to the questions were given by H. P. Blavatsky. The first installment of the "Transactions" was printed in the June issue of THEOSOPHY.

### APPENDIX.

[The following is the Summary of the teachings during several meetings which preceded the Transactions of the "Blavatsky Lodge of the T. S.," when the explanations of the *stanzas* from the "Secret Doctrine" became incorporated in a regular series of instructions.]

### DREAMS.

*Q. What are the "principles" which are active during dreams?*

A. The "principles" active during ordinary dreams—which ought to be distinguished from real dreams, and called idle visions —are *Kama,* the seat of the personal Ego and of desire awakened into chaotic activity by the slumbering reminiscences of the lower Manas.

*Q. What is the "lower Manas"?*

A. It is usually called the animal soul (the *Nephesh* of the Hebrew Kabalists). It is the ray which emanates from the Higher Manas or permanent EGO, and is that "principle" which forms the human mind—in animals instinct, for animals also dream.* The combined action of Kama and the "animal soul," however, are purely mechanical. It is instinct, not reason, which is active in them. During the sleep of the body they receive and send out mechanically electric shocks to and from various nerve-centres. The brain is hardly impressed by them, and memory stores them, of course, without order or sequence. On waking these impressions gradually fade out, as does every fleeting shadow that has no basic or substantial reality underlying it. The retentive faculty of the brain, however, may register and preserve them if they are only impressed strongly enough. But, as a rule, our memory registers only the fugitive and distorted impressions which the brain receives at the moment of awakening. This aspect

---

*Secret Doctrine* references are to the Original Edition. [ED. THEOSOPHY.]

*The word dream means really "to slumber"—the latter function being called in Russian *"dreamatj."*—ED.

of "dreams," however, has been sufficiently observed and is described correctly enough in modern physiological and biological works, as such human dreams do not differ much from those of the animals. That which is entirely *terra incognita* for Science is the real dreams and experiences of the higher EGO, which are also called dreams, but ought not to be so termed, or else the term for the other sleeping "visions" changed.

*Q. How do these differ?*

A. The nature and functions of real dreams cannot be understood unless we admit the existence of an immortal Ego in mortal man, independent of the physical body, for the subject becomes quite unintelligible unless we believe—that which is a fact—that during sleep there remains only an animated form of clay, whose powers of independent thinking are utterly paralyzed.

But if we admit the existence of a higher or permanent *Ego* in us—which Ego must not be confused with what we call the "Higher Self," we can comprehend that what we often regard as dreams, generally accepted as idle fancies, are, in truth, stray pages torn out from the life and experiences of the *inner* man, and the dim recollection of which at the moment of awakening becomes more or less distorted by our physical memory. The latter catches mechanically a few impressions of the thoughts, facts witnessed, and deeds performed by the *inner* man during its hours of complete freedom. For our *Ego* lives its own separate life within its prison of clay whenever it becomes free from the trammels of matter, *i. e.,* during the sleep of the physical man. This Ego it is which is the actor, the real man, the true human self. But the physical man cannot feel or be conscious during dreams; for the personality, the outer man, with its brain and thinking apparatus, are paralyzed more or less completely.

We might well compare the real Ego to a prisoner, and the physical personality to the gaoler of his prison. If the gaoler falls asleep, the prisoner escapes, or, at least, passes outside the walls of his prison. The gaoler is half asleep, and looks nodding all the time out of a window, through which he can catch only occasional glimpses of his prisoner, as he would a kind of shadow moving in front of it. But what can he perceive, and what can he know of the real actions, and especially the thoughts, of his charge?

*Q. Do not the thoughts of the one impress themselves upon the other?*

A. Not during sleep, at all events; for the real Ego does not think as his evanescent and temporary personality does. During the waking hours the thoughts and Voice of the Higher Ego do or do not reach his gaoler—the physical man, for they are the *Voice of his Conscience,* but during his sleep they are absolutely the "Voice in the desert." In the thoughts of the *real* man, or the immortal "Individuality," the pictures and visions of the Past and Future are as the Present; nor are his thoughts like ours, sub-

jective pictures in our cerebration, but living acts and deeds, present actualities. They are realities, even as they were when speech expressed in sounds did not exist; when thoughts were things, and men did not need to express them in speeches; for they instantly realised themselves in action by the power of *Kriya-Sakti,* that mysterious power which transforms instantaneously ideas into visible forms, and these were as objective to the "man" of the early *third* Race as objects of sight are now to us.

*Q. How, then, does Esoteric Philosophy account for the transmission of even a few fragments of those thoughts of the Ego to our physical memory which it sometimes retains?*

A. All such are reflected on the brain of the sleeper, like outside shadows on the canvas walls of a tent, which the occupier sees as he wakes. Then the man thinks that he has dreamed all that, and feels as though *he* had lived through something, while in reality it is the *thought-actions* of the true Ego which he has dimly perceived. As he becomes fully awake, his recollections become with every minute more distorted, and mingle with the images projected from the physical brain, under the action of the stimulus which causes the sleeper to awaken. These recollections, by the power of association, set in motion various trains of ideas.

*Q. It is difficult to see how the Ego can be acting during the night things which have taken place long ago. Was it not stated that dreams are not subjective?*

A. How can they be subjective when the dream state is itself for us, and on our plane, at any rate, a subjective one? To the dreamer (the Ego), on his own plane, the things on that plane are as objective to him as our acts are to us.

*Q. What are the senses which act in dreams?*

A. The senses of the sleeper receive occasional shocks, and are awakened into mechanical action; what he hears and sees are, as has been said, a distorted reflection of the thoughts of the Ego. The latter is highly spiritual, and is linked very closely with the higher principles, Buddhi and Atma. These higher principles are entirely inactive on our plane, and the higher Ego *(Manas)* itself is more or less dormant during the waking of the physical man. This is especially the case with persons of very materialistic mind. So dormant are the Spiritual faculties, because the Ego is so trammelled by matter, that *It* can hardly give all its attention to the man's actions, even should the latter commit sins for which that Ego—when reunited with its *lower* Manas—will have to suffer conjointly in the future. It is, as I said, the impressions projected into the physical man by this Ego which constitute what we call "conscience"; and in proportion as the Personality, the lower Soul (or *Manas),* unites itself to its higher consciousness, or Ego, does the action of the latter upon the life of mortal man become more marked.

*Q. This Ego, then, is the "Higher Ego"?*

A. Yes; it is the higher Manas illuminated by Buddhi; the principle of self-consciousness, the "I-am-I," in short. It is the Karana-Sarira, the immortal man, which passes from one incarnation to another.

*Q. Is the "register" or "table of memory" for the true dream-state different from that of waking life?*

A. Since dreams are in reality the actions of the Ego during physical sleep, they are, of course, recorded on their own plane and produce their appropriate effects on this one. But it must be always remembered that dreams in general, and as we know them, are simply our waking and hazy recollections of these facts.

It often happens, indeed, that we have no recollection of having dreamt at all, but later in the day the remembrance of the dream will suddenly flash upon us. Of this there are many causes. It is analogous to what sometimes happens to every one of us. Often a sensation, a smell, even a casual noise, or a sound, brings instantaneously to our mind long-forgotten events, scenes and persons. Something of what was seen, done, or thought by the "night-performer," the Ego, impressed itself at that time on the physical brain, but was not brought into the conscious, waking memory, owing to some physical condition or obstacle. This impression is registered on the brain in its appropriate cell or nerve centre, but owing to some accidental circumstance it "hangs fire," so to say, till something gives it the needed impulse. Then the brain slips it off immediately into the conscious memory of the waking man; for as soon as the conditions required are supplied, that particular centre starts forthwith into activity, and does the work which it had to do, but was hindered at the time from completing.

*Q. How does this process take place?*

A. There is a sort of conscious telegraphic communication going on incessantly, day and night, between the physical brain and the inner man. The brain is such a complex thing, both physically and metaphysically, that it is like a tree whose bark you can remove layer by layer, each layer being different from all the others, and each having its own special work, function, and properties.

*Q. What distinguishes the "dreaming" memory and imagination from those of waking consciousness?*

A. During sleep the physical memory and imagination are of course passive, because the dreamer is asleep: his brain is asleep, his memory is asleep, all his functions are dormant and at rest. It is only when they are stimulated, as I told you, that they are aroused. Thus the consciousness of the sleeper is not active, but passive. The inner man, however, the real Ego, acts independently during the sleep of the body; but it is doubtful if any of us—unless thoroughly acquainted with the physiology of occultism—could understand the nature of its action.

*Q. What relation have the Astral Light and Akâsa to memory?*

A. The former is the "tablet of the memory" of the animal man, the latter of the spiritual Ego. The "dreams" of the Ego, as much as the acts of the physical man, are all recorded, since both are actions based on causes and producing results. Our "dreams," being simply the waking state and actions of the true Self, must be, of course, recorded somewhere. Read "Karmic Visions" in *Lucifer,* and note the description of the real Ego, sitting as a spectator of the life of the hero, and perhaps something will strike you.

*Q. What, in reality, is the Astral Light?*

A. As the Esoteric Philosophy teaches us, the *Astral Light* is simply the dregs of *Akâsa* or the Universal Ideation in its metaphysical sense. Though invisible, it is yet, so to speak, the phosphorescent radiation of the latter, and is the medium between it and man's thought-faculties. It is these which pollute the Astral Light, and make it what it is—the storehouse of all human and especially psychic iniquities. In its primordial genesis, the astral light as a radiation is quite pure, though the lower it descends approaching our terrestrial sphere, the more it differentiates, and becomes as a result impure in its very constitution. But man helps considerably to this pollution, and gives it back its essence far worse than when he received it.

*Q. Can you explain to us how it is related to man, and its action in dream-life?*

A. Differentiation in the physical world is infinite. Universal ideation—or *Mahat,* if you like it—sends its homogeneous radiation into the heterogeneous world, and this reaches the human or *personal* mind through the Astral Light.

*Q. But do not our minds receive their illuminations direct from the Higher Manas through the Lower? And is not the former the pure emanation of divine Ideation—the "Manasa-Putras," which incarnated in men?*

A. They are. Individual *Manasa-Putras* or the Kumaras are the direct radiations of the divine Ideation—"individual" in the sense of later differentiation, owing to numberless incarnations. In sum they are the collective aggregation of that Ideation, become on our plane, or from our point of view, *Mahat,* as the Dhyan Chohans are in their aggregate the WORD or "Logos" in the formation of the World. Were the Personalities (Lower Manas or the *physical* minds) to be inspired and illumined solely by their higher *alter Egos* there would be little sin in this world. But they are not; and getting entangled in the meshes of the Astral Light, they separate themselves more and more from their parent Egos. Read and study what Eliphas Lévi says of the Astral Light, which he calls Satan and the Great Serpent. The Astral Light has been taken too literally to mean some sort of a second blue sky. This imaginary space, however, on which are impressed the countless

images of all that ever was, is, and will be, is but a too sad reality. It becomes in, and for, man—if at all psychic—and who is not?—a tempting Demon, his "evil angel," and the inspirer of all our worst deeds. It acts on the will of even the sleeping man, through visions impressed upon his slumbering brain (which visions must not be confused with the "dreams"), and these germs bear their fruit when he awakes.

*Q. What is the part played by Will in dreams?*

A. The will of the outer man, our volition, is of course dormant and inactive during dreams; but a certain bent can be given to the slumbering will during its inactivity, and certain after-results developed by the mutual inter-action—produced almost mechanically—through union between two or more "principles" into one, so that they will act in perfect harmony, without any friction or a single false note, when awake. But this is one of the dodges of "black magic," and when used for good purposes belongs to the training of an Occultist. One must be far advanced on the "path" to have a will which can act consciously during his physical sleep, or act on the will of another person during the sleep of the latter, *e. g.,* to control his dreams, and thus control his actions when awake.

*Q. We are taught that a man can unite all his "principles" into one—what does this mean?*

A. When an adept succeeds in doing this he is a *Jivanmukta:* he is no more of this earth virtually, and becomes a Nirvanee, who can go into *Samadhi* at will. Adepts are generally classed by the number of "principles" they have under their perfect control, for that which we call will has its seat in the higher EGO, and the latter, when it is rid of its sin-laden personality, is divine and pure.

*Q. What part does Karma play in dreams? In India they say that every man receives the reward or punishment of all his acts, both in the waking and the dream state.*

A. If they say so, it is because they have preserved in all their purity and remembered the traditions of their forefathers. They know that the Self is the *real* Ego, and that it lives and acts, though on a different plane. The external life is a "dream" to this Ego, while the inner life, or the life on what we call the dream plane, is the real life for it. And so the Hindus (the profane, of course) say that Karma is generous, and rewards the real man in dreams as well as it does the false personality in physical life.

*Q. What is the difference, "karmically," between the two?*

A. The physical animal man is as little responsible as a dog or a mouse. For the bodily form all is over with the death of the body. But the real SELF, that which emanated its own shadow, or the lower thinking personality, that enacted and pulled the wires during the life of the physical automaton, will have to suffer conjointly with its *factotum and alter ego* in its next incarnation.

*Q. But the two, the higher and the lower, Manas are one, are they not?*

A. They are, and yet they are not—and that is the great mystery. The Higher Manas or EGO is essentially divine, and therefore pure; no stain can pollute it, as no punishment can reach it, *per se,* the more so since it is innocent of, and takes no part in, the deliberate transactions of its Lower Ego. Yet by the very fact that, though dual and during life the Higher is distinct from the Lower, "the Father and Son" *are one,* and because that in re-uniting with the parent Ego, the Lower Soul fastens upon and impresses upon it all its bad as well as good actions—both have to suffer, the Higher Ego, though innocent and without blemish, has to bear the punishment of the misdeeds committed by the *lower* Self together with it in their future incarnation. The whole doctrine of atonement is built upon this old esoteric tenet; for the Higher Ego is the antitype of that which is on this earth the type, namely, the personality. It is, for those who understand it, the old Vedic story of Visvakarman over again, practically demonstrated. Visvakarman, the all-seeing Father-God, who is beyond the comprehension of mortals, ends, as son of Bhuvana, the holy Spirit, by *sacrificing himself to himself,* to save the worlds. The mystic name of the "Higher Ego" is, in the Indian philosophy, *Kshetrajna,* or "embodied Spirit," that which knows or informs *kshetra,* "the body." Etymologize the name, and you will find in it the term *aja,* "first-born," and also the "lamb." All this is very suggestive, and volumes might be written upon the pregenetic and postgenetic development of type and antitype—of Christ-*Kshetrajna,* the "God-Man," the First-born, symbolized as the "lamb." The *Secret Doctrine* shows that the Manasa-Putras or incarnating EGOS have taken upon themselves, voluntarily and knowingly, the burden of all the future sins of their future personalities. Thence it is easy to see that it is neither Mr. A. nor Mr. B., nor any of the personalities that periodically clothe the Self-Sacrificing EGO, which are the real Sufferers, but verily the innocent *Christos* within us. Hence the mystic Hindus say that the Eternal Self, or the Ego (the one in three and three in one), is the "Charioteer" or driver; the personalities are the temporary and evanescent passengers; while the horses are the animal passions of man. It is, then, true to say that when we remain deaf to the Voice of our Conscience, we crucify the Christos within us. But let us return to dreams.

*Q. Are so-called prophetic dreams a sign that the dreamer has strong clairvoyant faculties?*

A. It may be said, in the case of persons who have truly prophetic dreams, that it is because their physical brains and memory are in closer relation and sympathy with their "Higher Ego" than in the generality of men. The Ego-Self has more facilities for impressing upon the physical shell and memory that which is of importance to such persons than it has in the case of other less

gifted persons. Remember that the only God man comes in contact with is his own God, called Spirit, Soul and Mind, or Consciousness, and these three are one.

But there are weeds that must be destroyed in order that a plant may grow. We must die, said St. Paul, that we may live again. It is through destruction that we may improve, and the three powers, the preserving, the creating, and the destroying, are only so many aspects of the divine spark within man.

*Q. Do Adepts dream?*

A. No advanced Adept dreams. An adept is one who has obtained mastery over his four lower principles, including his body, and does not, therefore, let flesh have its own way. He simply paralyzes his lower Self during Sleep, and becomes perfectly free. A dream, as we understand it, is an illusion. Shall an adept, then, dream when he has rid himself of every other illusion? In his sleep he simply lives on another and more real plane.

*Q. Are there people who have never dreamed?*

A. There is no such man in the world so far as I am aware. All dream more or less; only with most, dreams vanish suddenly upon waking. This depends on the more or less receptive condition of the brain ganglia. Unspiritual men, and those who do not exercise their imaginative faculties, or those whom manual labour has exhausted, so that the ganglia do not act even mechanically during rest, dream rarely, if ever, with any coherence.

*Q. What is the difference between the dreams of men and those of beasts?*

A. The dream state is common not only to all men, but also to all animals, of course, from the highest mammalia to the smallest birds, and even insects. Every being endowed with a physical brain, or organs approximating thereto, must dream. Every animal, large or small, has, more or less, physical senses; and though these senses are dulled during sleep, memory will still, so to say, act mechanically, reproducing past sensations. That dogs and horses and cattle dream we all know, and so also do canaries, but such dreams are, I think, merely physiological. Like the last embers of a dying fire, with its spasmodic flare and occasional flames, so acts the brain in falling asleep. Dreams are not, as Dryden says, "interludes which fancy makes," for such can only refer to physiological dreams provoked by indigestion, or some idea or event which has impressed itself upon the active brain during waking hours.

*Q. What, then, is the process of going to sleep?*

A. This is partially explained by Physiology. It is said by Occultism to be the periodical and regulated exhaustion of the nervous centres, and especially of the sensory ganglia of the brain, which refuse to act any longer on this plane, and, if they would not become unfit for work, are compelled to recuperate their strength on another plane or *Upadhi*. First comes the *Svapna*, or

dreaming state, and this leads to that of *Shushupti.* Now it must be remembered that our senses are all dual, and act according to the plane of consciousness on which the thinking entity energises. Physical sleep affords the greatest facility for its action on the various planes; at the same time it is a necessity, in order that the senses may recuperate and obtain a new lease of life for the *Jagrata,* or waking state, from the *Svapna* and *Shushupti.* According to *Raj Yoga, Turya* is the highest state. As a man exhausted by one state of the life fluid seeks another; as, for example, when exhausted by the hot air he refreshes himself with cool water; so sleep is the shady nook in the sunlit valley of life.

Sleep is a sign that waking life has become too strong for the physical organism, and that the force of the life current must be broken by changing the waking for the sleeping state. Ask a good clairvoyant to describe the aura of a person just refreshed by sleep, and that of another just before going to sleep. The former will be seen bathed in rhythmical vibrations of life currents—golden, blue, and rosy; these are the electrical waves of Life. The latter is, as it were, in a mist of intense golden-orange hue, composed of atoms whirling with an almost incredible spasmodic rapidity, showing that the person begins to be too strongly saturated with Life; the life essence is too strong for his physical organs, and he must seek relief in the shadowy side of that essence, which side is the dream element, or physical sleep, one of the states of consciousness.

*Q. But what is a dream?*

A. That depends on the meaning of the term. You may "dream," or, as we say, sleep visions, awake or asleep. If the Astral Light is collected in a cup or metal vessel by will-power, and the eyes fixed on some point in it with a strong will to see, a waking vision or "dream" is the result, if the person is at all sensitive. The reflections in the Astral Light are seen better with closed eyes, and, in sleep, still more distinctly. From a lucid state, vision becomes translucid; from normal organic consciousness it rises to a transcendental state of consciousness.

*Q. To what causes are dreams chiefly due?*

A. There are many kinds of dreams, as we all know. Leaving the "digestion dream" aside, there are brain dreams and memory dreams, mechanical and conscious visions. Dreams of warning and premonition require the active co-operation of the inner Ego. They are also often due to the conscious or unconscious co-operation of the brains of two living persons, or of their two Egos.

*Q. What is it that dreams, then?*

A. Generally the physical brain of the personal Ego, the seat of memory, radiating and throwing off sparks like the dying embers of a fire. The memory of the Sleeper is like an Æolian seven-stringed harp; and his state of mind may be compared to the wind that sweeps over the chords. The corresponding string of the harp will respond to that one of the seven states of mental activity

in which the sleeper was before falling asleep. If it is a gentle breeze the harp will be affected but little; if a hurricane, the vibrations will be proportionately powerful. If the personal Ego is in touch with its higher principles and the veils of the higher planes are drawn aside, all is well; if on the contrary it is of a materialistic animal nature, there will be probably no dreams; or if the memory by chance catch the breath of a "wind" from a higher plane, seeing that it will be impressed through the sensory ganglia of the cerebellum, and not by the direct agency of the spiritual Ego, it will receive pictures and sounds so distorted and inharmonious that even a Devachanic vision would appear a nightmare or grotesque caricature. Therefore there is no simple answer to the question "What is it that dreams," for it depends entirely on each individual what principle will be the chief motor in dreams, and whether they will be remembered or forgotten.

*Q. Is the apparent objectivity in a dream really objective or subjective?*

A. If it is admitted to be apparent, then of course it is subjective. The question should rather be, to whom or what are the pictures or representations in dreams either objective or subjective? To the physical man, the *dreamer,* all he sees with his eyes shut, and in or through his mind, is of course subjective. But to the *Seer* within the physical dreamer, that Seer himself being subjective to our material senses, all he sees is as objective as he is himself to himself and to others like himself. Materialists will probably laugh, and say that we make of a man a whole family of entities, but this is not so. Occultism teaches that physical man is one, but the thinking man septenary, thinking, acting, feeling, and living on seven different states of being or planes of consciousness, and that for all these states and planes the permanent Ego (not the false personality) has a distinct set of senses.

*Q. Can these different senses be distinguished?*

A. Not unless you are an Adept or highly-trained Chela, thoroughly acquainted with these different states. Sciences, such as biology, physiology, and even psychology (of the Maudsley, Bain, and Herbert Spencer schools), do not touch on this subject. Science teaches us about the phenomena of volition, sensation, intellect, and instinct, and says that these are all manifested through the nervous centres, the most important of which is our brain. She will speak of the peculiar agent or substance through which these phenomena take place as the vascular and fibrous tissues, and explain their relation to one another, dividing the ganglionic centres into motor, sensory and sympathetic, but will never breathe one word of the mysterious agency of intellect itself, or of the mind and its functions.

Now, it frequently happens that we are conscious and know that we are dreaming; this is a very good proof that man is a multiple being on the thought plane; so that not only is the Ego, or thinking man, Proteus, a multiform, ever-changing entity, but

he is also, so to speak, capable of separating himself on the mind or dream plane into two or more entities; and on the plane of illusion which follows us to the threshold of Nirvâna, he is like Ain-Soph talking to Ain-Soph, holding a dialogue with himself and speaking through, about, and to himself. And this is the mystery of the inscrutable Deity in the *Zohar,* as in the Hindu philosophies; it is the same in the Kabbala, Puranas, Vedantic metaphysics, or even in the so-called Christian mystery of the Godhead and Trinity. Man is the microcosm of the macrocosm; the god on earth is built on the pattern of the god in nature. But the universal consciousness of the real Ego transcends a millionfold the self-consciousness of the personal or false Ego.

*Q. Is that which is termed "unconscious cerebration" during sleep a mechanical process of the physical brain, or is it a conscious operation of the Ego, the result of which only is impressed on the ordinary consciousness?*

A. It is the latter; for is it possible to remember in our conscious state what took place while our brain worked unconsciously? This is apparently a contradiction in terms.

*Q. How does it happen that persons who have never seen mountains in nature often see them distinctly in sleep, and are able to note their features?*

A. Most probably because they have seen pictures of mountains; otherwise it is somebody or something in us which has previously seen them.

*Q. What is the cause of that experience in dreams in which the dreamer seems to be ever striving after something, but never attaining it?*

A. It is because the physical self and its memory are shut out of the possibility of knowing what the real Ego does. The dreamer only catches faint glimpses of the doings of the Ego, whose actions produce the so-called dream on the physical man, but is unable to follow it consecutively. A delirious patient, on recovery, bears the same relation to the nurse who watched and tended him in his illness as the physical man to his real Ego. The Ego acts as consciously within and without him as the nurse acts in tending and watching over the sick man. But neither the patient after leaving his sick bed, nor the dreamer on awaking, will be able to remember anything except in snatches and glimpses.

*Q. How does sleep differ from death?*

A. There is an analogy certainly, but a very great difference between the two. In sleep there is a connection, weak though it may be, between the lower and higher mind of man, and the latter is more or less reflected into the former, however much its rays may be distorted. But once the body is dead, the body of illusion, *Mayavi Rupa,* becomes Kama Rupa, or the animal soul, and is left to its own devices. Therefore, there is as much difference between the spook and man as there is between a gross material, animal but sober mortal, and a man incapably drunk and unable

to distinguish the most prominent surroundings; between a person shut up in a perfectly dark room and one in a room lighted, however imperfectly, by some light or other.

The lower principles are like wild beasts, and the higher Manas is the rational man who tames or subdues them more or less successfully. But once the animal gets free from the master who held it in subjection; no sooner has it ceased to hear his voice and see him than it starts off again to the jungle and its ancient den. It takes, however, some time for an animal to return to its original and natural state, but these lower principles or "spooks" return instantly, and no sooner has the higher Triad entered the Devachanic state than the lower Duad rebecomes that which it was from the beginning, a principle endued with purely animal instinct, made happier still by the great change.

*Q. What is the condition of the Linga Sarira, or plastic body, during dreams?*

A. The condition of the Plastic form is to sleep with its body, unless projected by some powerful desire generated in the higher Manas. In dreams it plays no active part, but on the contrary is entirely passive, being the involuntarily half-sleepy witness of the experiences through which the higher principles are passing.

*Q. Under what circumstances is this wraith seen?*

A. Sometimes, in cases of illness or very strong passion on the part of the person seen or the person who sees; the possibility is mutual. A sick person especially just before death, is very likely to see in dream, or vision, those whom he loves and is continually thinking of, and so also is a person awake, but intensely thinking of a person who is asleep at the time.

*Q. Can a Magician summon such a dreaming entity and have intercourse with it?*

A. In black Magic it is no rare thing to evoke the "spirit" of a sleeping person; the sorcerer may then learn from the apparition any secret he chooses, and the sleeper be quite ignorant of what is occurring. Under such circumstances that which appears is the *Mayavi rupa*; but there is always a danger that the memory of the living man will preserve the recollections of the evocation and remember it as a vivid dream. If it is not, however, at a great distance, the Double or *Linga Sarira* may be evoked, but this can neither speak nor give information, and there is always the possibility of the sleeper being killed through this forced separation. Many sudden deaths in sleep have thus occurred, and the world been no wiser.

*Q. Can there be any connection between a dreamer and an entity in "Kama Loka"?*

A. The dreamer of an entity in *Kama Loka* would probably bring upon himself a nightmare, or would run the risk of becoming "possessed" by the "spook" so attracted, if he happened to be a

medium, or one who had made himself so passive during his waking hours that even his higher Self is now unable to protect him. This is why the mediumistic state of passivity is so dangerous, and in time renders the Higher Self entirely helpless to aid or even warn the sleeping or entranced person. Passivity paralyzes the connection between the lower and higher principles. It is very rare to find instances of mediums who, while remaining passive *at will,* for the purpose of communicating with some higher Intelligence, some *exterraneous* spirit (not disembodied), will yet preserve sufficiently their personal will so as not to break off all connection with the higher Self.

*Q. Can a dreamer be "en rapport" with an entity in Devachan?*

A. The only possible means of communicating with Devachanees is during sleep by a dream or vision, or in trance state. No Devachanee can descend into our plane; it is for us—or rather our *inner Self*—to ascend to his.

*Q. What is the state of mind of a drunkard during sleep?*

A. It is no real sleep, but a heavy stupor; no physical rest, but worse than sleeplessness, and kills the drunkard as quickly. During such stupor, as also during the waking drunken state, everything turns and whirls round in the brain, producing in the imagination and fancy horrid and grotesque shapes in continual motion and convolutions.

*Q. What is the cause of nightmare, and how is it that the dreams of persons suffering from advanced consumption are often pleasant?*

A. The cause of the former is simply physiological. A nightmare arises from oppression and difficulty in breathing; and difficulty in breathing will always create such a feeling of oppression and produce a sensation of impending calamity. In the second case, dreams become pleasant because the consumptive grows daily severed from his material body, and more clairvoyant in proportion. As death approaches, the body wastes away and ceases to be an impediment or barrier between the brain of the physical man and his Higher Self.

*Q. Is it a good thing to cultivate dreaming?*

A. It is by cultivating the power of what is called "dreaming" that clairvoyance is developed.

*Q. Are there any means of interpreting dreams—for instance, the interpretations given in dream-books?*

A. None but the clairvoyant faculty and the spiritual intuition of the "interpreter." Every dreaming Ego differs from every other, as our physical bodies do. If everything in the universe has seven keys to its symbolism on the physical plane, how many keys may it not have on higher planes?

*Q. Is there any way in which dreams may be classified?*

A. We may roughly divide also dreams into seven classes, and subdivide these in turn. Thus, we would divide them into:—

1. Prophetic dreams. These are impressed on our memory by the Higher Self, and are generally plain and clear: either a voice heard or the coming event foreseen.

2. Allegorical dreams, or hazy glimpses of realities caught by the brain and distorted by our fancy. These are generally only half true.

3. Dreams sent by adepts, good or bad, by mesmerisers, or by the thoughts of very powerful minds bent on making us do their will.

4. Retrospective; dreams of events belonging to past incarnations.

5. Warning dreams for others who are unable to be impressed themselves.

6. Confused dreams, the causes of which have been discussed above.

7. Dreams which are mere fancies and chaotic pictures, owing to digestion, some mental trouble, or such-like external cause.

---

# EFFECTS OF ALCOHOL*

*The effect of alcohol being degrading, why is it that a person under its influence will sometimes give expression to lofty sentiments and high moral teachings? A friend of mine knows a case of this kind. The person when in a drunken fit quotes many fine passages from the Bible and other sources.*

*W. Q. Judge.*—The assertion in the question is too sweeping. Some of the effects of alcohol are degrading, and some are not. It has many good uses. The abuse of it is what is degrading. There is no necessary sequence between the degrading effect and the utterance of lofty sentiments in every case, and yet in many cases there is. It is well known that—just as happens in hypnotism—the effect of alcohol may sometimes be to dull the outer brain and release the recollection of the teaching in early life of religious or lofty sentiments. This is like a phonograph which, as a machine, may repeat any good thing; the drunkard has become a maudlin machine. But the inner memory cannot be made drunk, and it is that memory which brings out the expression of lofty sentiments. In the same way morphine, more degrading in effect than alcohol, causes the taker sometimes to utter high sentiments and write magnificent literary matter.

*This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* for October, 1895. The title used is our own.—[ED. THEOSOPHY.]

# CYCLIC IMPRESSION AND RETURN AND OUR EVOLUTION*

LECTURE, APRIL 25, 1892, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, AMERICAN SECTION.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

*(Continued from September)*

NOW then, this law of impressions I have been talking about can be illustrated in this way: If you look at one of these electric lights—take away all the rest, leaving one only, so as to have a better impression—you will find the light makes an image on the retina, and when you shut your eye, this bright filament of light made by a carbon in an incandescent lamp will be seen by you in your eye. You can try it, and see for yourselves. If you keep your eye closed and watch intently, you will see the image come back a certain number of counts, it will stay a certain number of counts, it will go away in the same length of time and come back again, always changing in some respect, but always the image of the filament, until at last the time comes when it disappears apparently because other impressions have rubbed it out or covered it over. That means that there is a return even in the retina of the impression of this filament. After the first time, the color changes each time, and so it keeps coming back at regular intervals, showing that there is a cyclic return of impression in the retina, and as Brother Thomas said this morning, if that applies in one place, it applies in every place. And when we look into our moral character we find the same thing, for as we have the tides in the ocean, explained as they say by the moon,—which in my opinion does not explain it, but of course, being no scientist, my view is not worth much—so in man we have tides, which are called return of these impressions; that is to say, you do a thing once, there will be a tendency to repeat itself; you do it twice, and it doubles its influence, a greater tendency to do that same thing again. And so on all through our character shows this constant return of cyclic impression. We have these impressions from every point in space, every experience we have been through, everything that we can possibly go through at any time, even those things which our forefathers went through. And that is not unjust for this reason, that our forefathers furnished the line of bodily encasement, and we cannot enter that line of bodily encasement unless we are like unto it, and for that reason we must have been at some point in that cycle in that same line or family in the past, so that I must have had a hand in the past in constructing the particular family line in which

*This lecture was issued in pamphlet form and copies of it are rarely to be found. Its great value will be apparent to every student.—[ED. THEOSOPHY.]

I now exist, and am myself once more taking up the cyclic impression returning upon me.

Now this has the greatest possible bearing upon our evolution as particular individuals, and that is the only way in which I wish to consider the question of evolution here; not the broad question of the evolution of the universe, but our own evolution, which means our bodily life, as Madame Blavatsky, repeating the ancients, said to us so often, and as we found said by so many of the same school. An opportunity will arise for you to do something; you do not do it; you may not have it again for one hundred years. It is the return before you of some old thing that was good, if it is a good one, along the line of the cycles. You neglect it, as you may, and the same opportunity will return, mind you, but it may not return for many hundred years. It may not return until another life, but it will return under the same law.

Now take another case. I have a friend who is trying to find out all about theosophy, and about a psychic nature, but I have discovered that he is not paying the slightest attention to this subject of the inevitable return upon himself of these impressions which he creates. I discovered he had periods of depression, (and this will answer for everybody) when he had a despondency that he could not explain. I said to him, you have had the same despondency may-be seven weeks ago, may-be eight weeks ago, may-be five weeks ago. He examined his diary and his recollection, and he found that he had actual recurrences of despondency about the same distance apart. Well, I said, that explains to me how it is coming back. But what am I to do? Do what the old theosophists taught us; that is, we can only have these good results by producing opposite impressions to bad ones. So, take this occasion of despondency. What he should have done was, that being the return of an old impression, to have compelled himself to feel joyous, even against his will, and if he could not have done that, then to have tried to feel the joy of others. By doing that, he would have implanted in himself another impression, that is of joy, so that when this thing returned once more, instead of being of the same quality and extension, it would have been changed by the impression of joy or elation and the two things coming together would have counteracted each other, just as two billiard balls coming together tend to counteract each other's movements. This applies to every person who has the blues. This does not apply to me, and I think it must be due to the fact that in some other life I have had the blues. I have other things, but the blues never.

I have friends and acquaintances who have these desponding spells. It is the return of old cyclic impressions, or the cyclic return of impressions. What are you to do? Some people say, I just sit down and let it go; that is to say, you sit there and create it once more. You cannot rub it out if it has been coming, but when it comes, start up something else, start up cheerfulness, be good to some

one, then try to relieve some other person who is despondent, and you will have started another impression, which will return at the same time. It does not make any difference if you wait a day or two to do this. The next day, or a few days after will do, for when the old cyclic impression returns, it will have dragged up the new one, because it is related to it by association.

This has a bearing on the question of the civilization in which we are a point ourselves.

Who are we? Where are we going? Where have we come from? I told you that the old Egyptians disappeared. If you inquire into Egyptian history, the most interesting because the most obscure, you will find, as the writers say, that the civilization seems to rise to the zenith at once. We do not see when it began. The civilization was so great it must have existed an enormous length of time to get to that height, so that we cannot trace it from its beginning, and it disappears suddenly from the sky; there is nothing of it left but the enormous remains which testify to these great things, for the ancient Egyptians not only made mummies in which they displayed the art of bandaging that we cannot better, but they had put everything to such a degree of specialization that we must conclude they had many centuries of civilization. There was a specialist for one eye and a specialist for the other, a specialist for the eyebrow, and so on. In my poor and humble opinion, we are the Egyptians.

We have come back again, after our five thousand or whatever years' cycle it is, and we have dragged back with us some one called the Semitic race, with which we are connected by some old impression that we cannot get rid of, and so upon us is impinged that very Semitic image. We have drawn back with us, by the inevitable law of association in cyclic return, some race, some personages connected with us by some acts of ours in that great old civilization now disappeared, and we cannot get rid of it; we must raise them up to some other plane as we raise ourselves.

I think in America is the evidence that this old civilization is coming back, for in the theosophical theory nothing is lost. If we were left to records, buildings and the like, they would soon disappear and nothing could ever be recovered; there never would be any progress. But each individual in the civilization, wherever it may be, puts the record in himself, and when he comes into the favorable circumstances described by Patanjali, an old Hindoo, when he gets the apparatus, he will bring out the old impression. The ancients say each act has a thought under it, and each thought makes a mental impression; and when the apparatus is provided, there will then arise that new condition, in rank, place and endowment.

So we retain in ourselves the impression of all the things that we have done, and when the time comes that we have cycled back,

over and over again, through the middle ages perhaps, into England, into Germany, into France, we come at last to an environment such as is provided here, just the thing physically and every other way to enable us to do well, and to enable the others who are coming after us. I can almost see them; they are coming in a little army from the countries of the old world to endeavor to improve this one; for here ages ago there was a civilization also, perhaps we were in it then, perhaps anterior to the ancient Egyptians. It disappeared from here, when we do not know, and it left this land arid for many thousands of years until it was discovered once more by the Europeans. The ancient world, I mean Europe, has been poisoned, the land has been soaked with the emanations, poisoned by the emanations of the people who have lived upon it; the air above it is consequently poisoned by the emanations from the land; but here in America, just the place for the new race, is an arable land which has had time over and over again to destroy the poisons that were planted here ages and ages ago. It gives us a new land, with vibrations in the air that stir up every particle in a man who breathes it, and thus we find the people coming from the old world seeming to receive through their feet the impressions of an American country. All this bears upon our civilization and race.

We are here a new race in a new cycle, and persons who know say that a cycle is going to end in a few years and a new one begin, and that that ending and beginning will be accompanied by convulsions of society and of nature. We can all almost see it coming. The events are very complete in the sky. You remember Daniel says, "A time, half a time, and a time," and so on, and people in the Christian system have been trying to find out the time when the time began, and that is just the difficulty. We do not know when the time began. And the only person who in all these many years has made a direct statement is Madame Blavatsky, and she said, "A cycle is ending in a few years, you must prepare." So that it was like the old prophets who came to the people and said, "Prepare for a new era of things, get ready for what you have to do." That is just what this civilization is doing. It is the highest, although the crudest, civilization now on the earth. It is the beginning of the great civilization that is to come, when old Europe has been destroyed; when the civilizations of Europe are unable to do any more, then this will be the place where the new great civilization will begin to put out a hand once more to grasp that of the ancient East, who has sat there silently doing nothing all these years, holding in her ancient crypts and libraries and records the philosophy which the world wants, and it is this philosophy and this ethics that the Theosophical Society is trying to give you. It is a philosophy you can understand and practise.

It is well enough to say to a man, "Do right," but after a while, in this superstitious era, he will say, "Why should I do right, unless I feel like it?" When you are showing these laws, that he must

come back in his cycle; that he is subject to evolution; that he is a reincarnated pilgrim soul, then he will see the reason why, and then in order to get him a secure basis, he accepts the philosophy, and that is what the Theosophical Society and the theosophical movement are trying to do. Brother George Mead said the other day, in speaking of a subject like this, that the great end and aim is the great renunciation. That is, that after progressing to great heights, which you can only do by unselfishness, at last you say to yourself, "I may take the ease to which I am entitled." For what prevails in one place must prevail in another, and in the course of progress we must come at last to a time when we can take our ease, but if you say to yourself, "I will not take it, but as I know this world and all the people on it are bound to live and last for many thousand years more, and if not helped perhaps might fail, I will not take it but I will stay here and I will suffer, because of having greater knowledge and greater sensitiveness"—this is the great renunciation as theosophy tells us. I know we do not often talk this way, because many of us think that the people will say to us at once when we talk of the great renunciation, "I don't want it; it is too much trouble." So generally we talk about the fine progress, and how you will at last escape the necessity of reincarnation, and at last escape the necessity of doing this or that and the other, but if you do your duty, you must make up your mind when you reach the height, when you know all, when you participate in the government of the world—not of a town, but the actual government of the world and the people upon it—instead of sleeping away your time, you will stay to help those who are left behind, and that is the great renunciation. That is what is told of Buddha, and of Jesus. Doubtless the whole story about Jesus, which cannot be proved historically to my mind, is based upon the same thing that we call renunciation. He was crucified after two or three years' work. But we say it means that this being divine resolves he will crucify himself in the eyes of the world, in the eyes of others, so that he can save men. Buddha did the same thing long before Jesus is said to have been born. The story that he made the great renunciation just means that which I have been telling you, instead of escaping from this horrible place, as it seems to us. For this is indeed horrible, as we look at it, surrounded by obstructions, liable to defeat at any moment, liable to wake up in the morning after planning a great reform, and see it dashed to the ground. Instead of escaping all that, he remained in the world and started his doctrine, which he knew at least would be adhered to by some. But this great doctrine of renunciation teaches that instead of working for yourself, you will work to know everything, to do everything in your power for those who may be left behind you, just as Madame Blavatsky says in the *Voice of the Silence*, "Step out of the sunshine into the shade, to make more room for others."

Isn't that better than a heaven which is reached at the price of the damnation of those of your relatives who will not believe a dogma? Is this not a great philosophy and a great religion which includes the salvation and regeneration, the scientific upraising and perfecting of the whole human family, and every particle in the whole universe, instead of imagining that a few miserable beings after seventy years of life shall enter into paradise, and then they look behind to see the torments in hell of those who would not accept a dogma?

What are these other religions compared with that? How any man can continue to believe such an idea as the usual one of damnation for merely unbelief I cannot comprehend. I had rather —if I had to choose—be an idolator of the most pronounced kind, who believed in Indra, and be left with my common reasoning, than believe in such a doctrine as that which permits me to suppose that my brother who does not believe a dogma is sizzling in hell while I, by simply believing, may enjoy myself in heaven.

Theosophists, if they will learn the doctrine and try to explain it, will reform this world. It will percolate everywhere, infiltrate into every stratum of society and prevent the need of legislation. It will alter the people, whereas you go on legislating and leaving this world's people as they are, and you will have just what happened in France. Capitalists in that day, in the day of the revolution—that is the royalists—oppressed the people. At last the people rose up and philosophers of the day instituted the reign of reason, and out of the reign of reason—mind you they had introduced there a beautiful idea of mankind, that idea struck root in a soil that was not prepared—came the practice of murdering other people by the wholesale until streams of blood ran all over France. So you see if something is not done to raise the people what the result will be. We have seen in Chicago the result of such acts, the mutterings of such a storm if the theosophical philosophy—call it by any other name you like—is not preached and understood. But if these old doctrines are not taught to the race you will have a revolution, and instead of making progress in a steady, normal fashion, you will come up to better things through storm, trouble and sorrow. You will come up, of course, for even out of revolutions and blood there comes progress, but isn't it better to have progress without that? And that is what the theosophical philosophy is intended for. That is why the Mahâtmas we were talking about, directing their servant H. P. Blavatsky, as they have directed many before, came out at a time when materialism was fighting religion and was about getting the upper hand, and once more everything moved forward in its cyclic way and these old doctrines were revivified under the guidance of the theosophical movement. They are doctrines that explain all problems and in the universal scheme give man a place as a potential god.

# ROUNDS AND RACES*

A FUNDAMENTAL axiom in Theosophy is that no one should accept as unquestionably true any statement of fact, principle, or theory which he has not tested for himself. This does not exclude a reasonable reliance upon testimony; but only that blind credulity which sometimes passes for faith. As we understand the rule, it is that we should at all times keep a clear and distinct boundary between what we know, and what we only accept provisionally on the testimony of those who have had larger experience until we reach a point of view from which we can see its truth. We owe it to ourselves to enlarge the sphere of clear knowledge and to push back as far as possible the boundary of opinion and hypothesis.

The realm of knowledge has various departments. Our physical senses furnish us one class of knowledge; our intellectual powers investigate another field on mathematical lines; and yet another faculty enables us to apprehend ethical teachings and to trace them to their true basis in Karma. That we have other faculties, now largely latent, which when developed will enable us to enter other fields of observation and investigation, is beginning to be seen and appreciated. Among the subjects which man may thus in the future examine for himself is a large block of truth concerning evolution, the out-breathing of the Great Breath, the birth and development of a chain of globes, and of human life thereon, some part of which has been imparted to us by those who claim to know, and which is chiefly useful, perhaps, for the light which it throws on our surroundings, our destiny, and our duty.

The grander sweeps of this block of truth are given to us in the barest outline, and not until our present physical earth is reached do we find anything like detailed information. From the hints given out, however, and reasoning according to the doctrine of correspondences, "as above, so below", we may plausibly infer many things in regard to other globes and other systems; but such flights can hardly be taken with much profit or advantage until we become thoroughly familiar with the things that are revealed in regard to our immediate surroundings.

In reading what has been written about the evolution of our planetary chain, it becomes apparent that some writers either did not have clear views on the subject, or that confusion and even contradiction have resulted from difficulty in finding words adapted to its expression and in using the words chosen in a strictly consistent manner. The article entitled "Evolution" found on page 117 of THE PATH for July, 1892, is, it seems to me, open to this objection; and I ask leave of the Editor to contribute briefly to the work of making the subject more clear.

---

*This article was first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for December, 1892.

The planetary chain consists of seven companion globes, which for convenience of reference are named from the first seven letters of the alphabet, A, B, C, D, E, F, and G. We occupy globe D, the fourth in the chain. The course of evolution begins on globe A, and proceeds by regular stages through globes B, C, D, E, etc. In the beginning, globe A was first evolved, and life received a certain degree of development upon it; then globe B came into existence, and the life-wave removed from globe A to B, where it went forward another stage; then globe C was evolved and received the life wave for a still further stage in its progress; and so on, until at the end of the first round globe G was evolved and furnished the field for the highest development attainable in that round.

The first round—the first tour of the life-wave through the seven globes from A to G—having been completed, the monads—the life wave—passed again to globe A, and commenced the second round, or the second tour through the chain. Without following out details, it is enough to say that three such rounds have been completed, and the fourth round has commenced its sweep and is still in progress; and that we now occupy globe D in this fourth round. Three times the life-wave was passed from globe A to globe G; and has now reached globe D in its fourth tour through the chain.

Now, leaving entirely out of sight for the present what has happened during the former three rounds, and on globes A, B, and C in this fourth round, let us consider what has happened on globe D since the life-wave reached it this fourth time; prefacing, however, the general statement that this globe will be exhausted and the life-wave be ready to pass from it to Globe E when seven root-races shall have finished their course here. Each root-race is divided into seven sub-races; and each sub-race into seven family-races; and so on; these divisions and subdivisions following each the other, and not coëxisting, except as an earlier race or division of a race may survive its time and overlap a subsequent race or division. Since the life-wave reached globe D in this fourth round, four root-races have run their course upon it, and the fifth root-race has reached its fifth subdivision or sub-race, of which we are part. This fifth sub-race is said to be preparing in America for transition or transformation into the sixth sub-race; it is not entirely clear whether we in the United States to-day belong to the seventh family-race of the fifth sub-race, or to the first family race of the sixth sub-race. It seems certain that we are near the transition point, unless there must be an intervening pralayic period.

The sixth and seventh sub-races of the fifth root-race must run their course, and these must be followed by the sixth and seventh root-races with their various subdivisions, before the life-wave passes from our present globe D and begins its further evolution on globe E. From analogy we may infer that seven great races, with their sub-races, etc., will be necessary to complete the work of that

globe; and the same for globes F and G, before the fourth round shall be concluded and the life-wave be ready to pass to globe A for the beginning of the fifth round.

Thus the planetary chain consists of seven globes; the life-wave makes during the existence of the chain seven complete tours of the chain from globe A to globe G, these tours being called rounds; the life-wave remains on each globe after reaching it in each round, until it completes seven root races, divided into forty-nine sub-races and into three hundred forty-three family-races.

It should be remembered that the flow of the life-wave is not continuous: it has its ebb as well as its flood. There is a period of rest or pralaya after the close of each round before another is commenced: a pralaya after each globe in the round; similarly each race, sub-race, etc., is preceded and followed by its pralayic rest. The purpose of this paper is not to develop the entire scheme in all its completeness, even if that were possible; but to bring out as sharply as may be the general outlines, and especially to note the distinction between rounds and races, the seven rounds being seven circuits of the entire chain, while the seven root-races are seven life-waves (or seven repetitions of the same wave) which consecutively flow and ebb on each globe before leaving it. There are seven root-races on each globe; forty-nine root-races in each round; three hundred and forty-three root-races in the seven rounds which complete the life of the planetary chain.

In studying this subject, it must be borne in mind that, while numerous passages in the *Secret Doctrine* refer to universal cosmogony and the evolution of the solar system and of our planetary chain, still the bulk of that work is devoted to the evolution of humanity on globe D in the fourth round only. It must also be remembered that the groups of monads discussed in "Theosophical Gleanings" in vol. vi of *Lucifer* are not to be taken as identical with the seven root-races through which the monadic host passes on each globe in each round.

The foregoing outline of the course of evolution through the *SEVEN ETERNITIES* of a maha-manvantara is mechanical and clumsy; it is only a skeleton, which must be clothed upon with muscles and sinews by reading between the lines before its true relations and proportions can be understood. The following quotations from *The Secret Doctrine* will perhaps throw a ray of light upon the connection of the globes of the chain: "It only stands to reason that the globes which overshadow our earth must be on different and superior planes. In short, as globes, they are in co-ADUNITION but not IN CONSUBSTANTIALITY WITH OUR EARTH". (The capitals are in the text). Vol. I, p. 166.

"When 'other worlds' are mentioned . . . the Occultist does not locate these spheres either *inside* or *outside* our earth . . . for their location is nowhere in the space *known* to and conceived by the profane. They are, as it were, blended with our

world, interpenetrating it and interpenetrated by it". Vol. I, p. 605.

In a foot note to page 265 of Walker's work on Reïncarnation, (Lovell's edition), the opinion is expressed that the figures (seven planets, seven rounds, seven races, etc.), are only symbols; even so: if they are symbols, they must no less be clearly apprehended before the truths symbolized can be grasped.

ALPHA.

---

# STAR-ANGEL-WORSHIP IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH*

*(Continued from September)*

After this, they went on appearing to seers and saints, with greater frequency than before, and clamoured even more loudly for a special place of worship. They *demanded* the re-erection on the same spot (the *Thermæ*) of a temple which should be called the "Church of *the Seven Angels.*"

But there was the same difficulty as before. The Popes had pronounced the original titles demon-names, *i. e.,* those of Pagan gods, and to introduce them into the church service would have been fatal. The "mystery names" of the seven angels could not be given. True enough, when the old "miraculous" picture with the seven names on it had been found, these names had been freely used in the church services. But, at the period of the *Renaissance,* Pope Clement XI. had ordered a special report to be made on them as they stood on the picture. It was a famous astronomer of that day, a Jesuit, named Joseph Biancini, who was entrusted with this delicate mission. The result to which the inquest led, was as unexpected as it was fatal to the worshippers of the seven Sabian gods; the Pope, while commanding that the picture should be preserved, ordered the seven angelic names to be *carefully rubbed out.* And "though these names are traditional," and "although they have *naught to do* with," and are "very different from the names used by Adalbert" (the Bishop-magician of Magdeburg), as the chronicler cunningly adds, yet even their mention was forbidden in the holy churches of Rome.

Thus affairs went on from 1527 till 1561; the Rector trying to satisfy the orders of his *seven* "guides,"—the church fearing to adopt even the Chaldean substitutes for the "mystery-names" as they had been so "desecrated by magical practices." We are not told, however, why the mystery-names, far less known than their substitutes have ever been, should not have been given out if the blessed "Thrones" enjoyed the smallest confidence. But, it must have been "small" indeed, since one finds the "Seven Archangels"

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for July, 1888.

demanding their restitution for 34 years, and refusing positively to be called by any other name, and the church still deaf to their desires. The Occultists do not conceal the reason why they have ceased to use them: *they are dangerously magical.* But why should the Church fear them? Have not the Apostles, and Peter preeminently, been told "whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven," and were they not given power over every demon known and unknown? Nevertheless, some of the mystery names may be still found along with their substitutes in old Roman missals printed in 1563. There is one in the Barberini library with the whole mass-service in it, and the forbidden truly Sabian names of the seven "great gods" flashing out ominously hither and thither.

The "gods" lost patience once more. Acting in a truly Jehovistic spirit with their "stiff-necked" worshippers, they sent a plague. A terrible epidemic of *obsession* and *possession* broke out in 1553, "when almost all Rome found itself possessed by the devil," says de Mirville (without explaining whether the clergy were included). Then only Duca's wish was realized. His seven Inspirers were invoked in their own names, and "the epidemic ceased as by enchantment, the blessed ones," adds the chronicler, "proving by the divine powers they possessed, once more, that they had nothing in common *with the demons of the same name,"—i. e.,* the Chaldean gods.*

"Then Michael Angelo was summoned in all haste by Paul IV. to the Vatican." His magnificent plan was accepted and the building of the former church begun. Its construction lasted over three years. In the archives of this now celebrated edifice, one can read that: "the narrative of the miracles that occurred during that period could not be undertaken, as it was *one incessant miracle of three years' duration."* In the presence of all his cardinals, Pope Paul IV. ordered that the seven names, as originally written on the picture, should be restored, and inscribed around the large copy from it that surmounts to this day the high altar.

The admirable temple was consecrated to the Seven Angels in 1561. The object of the Spirits was reached; three years later, nearly simultaneously, Michael Angelo and Antonio Duca both died. They were no longer wanted.

Duca was the first person buried in the church for the erection of which he had fought the best part of his life and finally procured for his heavenly patrons. On his tomb the summary of the revelations obtained by him, as also the catalogue of the prayers and invocations, of the penances and fasts used as means of getting the "blessed" revelations and more frequent visits from the "Seven"—are engraved. In the vestry a sight of the documents attesting to, and enumerating some of the phenomena of "the incessant miracle of three years' duration" may be obtained for a small fee. The record of the "miracles" bears the *imprimatur* of a Pope and sev-

* But they had proved their *power* earlier by sending the war, the destruction of the church, and finally the epidemic; and this does not look very *angelic*—to an Occultist.

eral Cardinals, but it still lacks that of the Society for Psychical Research. The "Seven Angels" must be needing the latter badly, as without it their triumph will never be complete. Let us hope that the learned Spookical Researchers will send their "smart boy" to Rome at an early day, and that the "blessed ones" may find at Cambridge—a Duca.

But what became of the "mystery names" so cautiously used and what of the new ones? First of all came the substitution of the name of Eudiel for one of the Kabalistic names. Just one hundred years later, all the seven names suddenly disappeared, by order of the Cardinal Albitius. In the old and venerable Church of *Santa Maria della Pieta* on the Piazza Colonna, the "miraculous" painting of the Seven Archangels may be still seen, but the names have been scratched out and the places repainted. *Sic transit gloria.* A little while after that the mass and vesper services of the "Seven" were once more eliminated from the missals used, notwithstanding that "they are quite distinct" from those of the "planetary Spirits" who used to help Bishop Adalbert. But as "the robe does not really make the monk," so the change of names cannot prevent the individuals that had them from being the same as they were before. They are still worshipped and this is all that my article aims to prove.

Will this be denied? In that case I have to remind the readers that so late as in 1825, a Spanish grandee supported by the Archbishop of Palermo made an attempt before Leo XII. for the simultaneous re-establishment *of the service and names.* The Pope granted the Church service *but refused the permission to use the old names.**

"This service, perfected and amplified by order of Paul IV., the minutes of which exist to this day at the *Vatican* and the *Minerva,* remained in force during the whole pontificate of Leo X." The Jesuits were those who rejoiced the most at the resurrection of the old worship, in view of the prodigious help they received from it, as it ensured the success of their proselyting efforts in the Philippine Islands. Pope Pius V. conceded the same "divine service" to Spain, saying in his Bull, that "one could never exalt too much *these seven Rectors* of the world, *figured by the* SEVEN PLANETS," and that . . . "it looked consoling and augured well for this century, that by the grace of God, the cult *of these seven ardent lights,* and these *seven stars,* was regaining all its lustre in the Christian republic."[1]

The same "holy Pope permitted moreover to the nuns of *Matritensis* to establish the *fête* of JEHUDIEL the patron of their convent." Whether another less pagan name has now been substituted for it we are not informed— not does it in the least matter.

---

* This is quoted from the volumes of the Marquis de Mirville's *"Pneumatologie des Esprits,"* Vol. II. p. 388. A more rabid papist and ultramontane having never existed, his testimony can hardly be suspected. He seems to glory in this idolatry and is loud in demanding its *public* and universal restoration.

1 p. 358, *ibid.* Vide *infra.*

In 1832 the same demand in a petition to spread the worship of the "Seven Spirits of God," was reiterated, endorsed this time by *eighty-seven bishops* and thousands of officials with high-sounding names in the Church of Rome. Again, in 1858, Cardinal Patrizzi and King Ferdinand II. in the name *of all the people of Italy* reiterated their petition; and again, finally, in 1862. Thus, the Church services in honour of the seven "Spirit-Stars" have never been abrogated since 1825. To this day they are in full vigour in Palermo, in Spain, and even in Rome at "St. Mary of the Angels" and the *"Gésu"*—though entirely suppressed everywhere else; all this "because of Adalbert's *heresy,"* de Mirville and the other supporters of Star-Angel worship are pleased to say. In reality there is no reason but the one already disclosed for it. Even the seven substitutes, especially the last four, have been too openly connected with black magic and astrology.

Writers of the de Mirville type are in despair. Not daring to blame the Church, they vent their wrath upon the old Alchemists and Rosicrucians. They clamour for the restitution of a public worship notwithstanding; and the imposing association formed since 1862 in Italy, Bavaria, Spain and elsewhere for the re-establishment of the cult of the Seven Spirits *in all its fullness* and in all Catholic Europe, gives hope that in a few years more the Seven Rishis of India now happily domiciled in the constellation of the Great Bear will become by the grace and will of some infallible Pontiff of Rome the legal and honoured divine patrons of Christendom.

And why not, since (St.) George is to this day, "the patron Saint of not only Holy Russia, Protestant Germany, fairy Venice, but also of merry England, whose soldiers," says W. M. Braithwaite,[1]—"would uphold his prestige with their hearts' blood." And surely our "Seven gods" cannot be worse than was the rascally George of Cappadocia during his lifetime!

Hence, with the courage of true believers, the Christian defenders of the Seven Star-Angels deny nothing, at any rate they keep silent whenever accused of rendering divine honours to Chaldean and other gods. They even admit the identity and proudly confess to the charge of star-worshipping. The accusation has been thrown many a time by the French Academicians into the teeth of their late leader, the Marquis de Mirville, and this is what he writes in reply:

"We are accused of mistaking stars for angels. The charge is acquiring such a wide notoriety that we are forced to answer it very seriously. It is impossible that we should try to dissimulate it without failing in frankness and courage, since this *pretended mistake* is repeated incessantly in the Scriptures as in our theology. We shall examine . . . this opinion hitherto so accredited, to-day discredited, and which attributes rightly to our SEVEN PRINCIPAL

[1] "St. George for Merry England", by W. M. Braithwaite. *Masonic Monthly*, No. 2.

SPIRITS the rulership, not of the seven known planets, with which we are reproached, but of the seven PRINCIPAL planets[2]—which is quite a different thing."[3]

And the author hastens to cite the authority of Babinet, the astronomer, who sought to prove in an able article of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (May, 1885), that in reality besides the earth we had only SEVEN big planets.

The "seven *principal* planets" is another confession to the acceptance of a purely occult tenet. Every planet according to the esoteric doctrine is in its composition a *Septenary* like man, in its principles. That is to say, *the visible planet is the physical body* of the sidereal being the *Atma* or Spirit of which is the Angel, or Rishi, or Dhyan-Chohan, or Deva, or whatever we call it. This belief as the occultists will see (read in *Esoteric Buddhism* about the constitution of the planets) is thoroughly occult. It is a tenet of the Secret Doctrine—*minus* its idolatrous element—pure and simple. As taught in the Church and her rituals, however, and especially, as *practised,* it is ASTROLATRY as pure and as simple.

There is no need to show here the difference between teaching, or theory, and practice in the holy Roman Catholic Church. The words "Jesuit" and "Jesuitism" cover the whole ground. The Spirit of Truth has departed ages ago—if it has ever been near it —from the Church of Rome. At this, the Protestant Church, so full of brotherly spirit and love for her sister Church, will say; *Amen.* The Dissenter, whose heart is as full of the love of Jesus as of hatred towards Ritualism and its mother Popery, will chuckle.

In the editorial of the *Times* for November 7, 1866, stands "A Terrible Indictment" against the Protestants, which says:

"Under the influence of the Episcopal Bench, all the studies connected with theology have withered, until English Biblical critics are the scorn of foreign scholars. Whenever we take up the work of a theologian who is likely to be a Dean or a Bishop, we find, *not* an earnest inquirer setting forth the results of *honest research,* but merely an advocate, who, we can perceive, has begun his work with the fixed determination of *proving black white* in favour of his own traditional system."

If the Protestants do not recognise the "Seven Angels," nor, while refusing them divine worship, do they feel ashamed and afraid of their names, as the Roman Catholics do, on the other hand they are guilty of *"Jesuitism"* of another kind, just as bad. For, while professing to believe the Scriptures a direct *Revelation* from God, not one sentence of which should be altered under the penalty of eternal damnation, they yet tremble and cower before the discoveries of science, and try to pander to their great enemy. Geology, Anthropology, Ethnology and Astronomy, are to them what Uriel, Scaltiel, Jehudiel and Barachiel are to the Roman Catholic Church.

---

[2] These "principal planets" are the *mystery planets* of the pagan Initiates, but travestied by dogma and priestcraft.

[3] *Pneumatologie des Esprits,* Vol. II. *Memoire adresse aux Academies,* p. 359, *et seq.*

It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. And since neither one nor the other of the two religions will abstain from anathematizing, slandering and persecuting Magic, Occultism, and even Theosophy, it is but just and proper that in their turn the Students of the Sacred Science of old should retort at last, and keep on telling the truth fearlessly to the faces of both.

MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PREVALEBIT.

H. P. B.

---

# QUESTION ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA*

*On page 10 of May* FORUM, *in answer to Question 5, appears the following: "Those actions which in the moment are like nectar, are, in the long run like poison;—and those actions which in the moment are like poison, are, in the long run like nectar;"* (Bhagavad-Gita). *This sentence seems to indicate that one should always do* that *which is disagreeable; that that I would do, I should not do, and that that I would not do, I should do. We are all seeking the truth from a* strong desire *to* know *of the truth;—should we curb that desire and seek falsehood? For one I would like to see* every *man reap the full rewards of his labor;—should I curb that desire and despoil him (or assist) of those rewards? No man, however base, loves to be deceived, and there are some who do not like to practise deception;—shall we curb that desire and practise deception? Shall or should we learn to sip poison from nectar, and then nectar from poison? If so we must learn to* love *both; evidently there is something lacking in the sentence quoted.*

*W. Q. Judge.*—The confusion produced as shown in this question is due to the fact that *C. F. W.* did not quote the words of the chapter in question, and that the questioner did not consult the *Gita* for himself. It refers solely to pleasure or benefit or enjoyment and not to actions specifically. It mentions three kinds of pleasures. The first is due to a purified understanding and will appear in the beginning to the man who has lived in the senses to be *as* poison, that is, objectionable, but the end will be "as the waters of life," because it arises from *satwa* or truth. This does not mean we are to seek for poisonous or disagreeable things. The second sort of pleasure is derived from our senses, seems sweet at first, but in the end will be as poison, being derived from passion or *rajas*. The third includes all those so-called pleasures which in beginning and end are bad in themselves. Looked at in this way and having read the chapter the questioner will not ask the question; he ought to read the poem.

---

*This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* for October, 1895. The title used is our own.—[ED. THEOSOPHY.]

# PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHICULES*

> "We shall in vain interpret their words by the notions of our philosophy and the doctrines in our schools."
>
> —LOCKE.

> "Knowledge of the lowest kind is *ununified* knowledge; Science is *partially unified* knowledge; Philosophy is *completely unified* knowledge."—HERBERT SPENCER'S *First Principles.*

NEW accusations are brought by captious censors against our Society in general and Theosophy, especially. We will summarize them as we proceed along, and notice the "freshest" denunciation.

We are accused of being illogical in the "Constitution and Rules" of the Theosophical Society; and contradictory in the practical application thereof. The accusations are framed in this wise:—

In the published "Constitution and Rules" great stress is laid upon the absolutely non-sectarian character of the Society. It is constantly insisted upon that it has no creed, no philosophy, no religion, no dogmas, and even no special views of its own to advocate, still less to impose on its members. And yet—

"Why, bless us! is it not as undeniable a fact that certain very definite views of a philosophic and, strictly speaking, of a religious character are held by the Founders and most prominent members of the Society?"

"Verily so," we answer. "But where is the alleged *contradiction* in this? Neither the Founders, nor the 'most prominent members,' nor yet the majority thereof, constitute *the* Society, but only a certain portion of it, which, moreover, having no creed as a body, yet allows its members to believe as and what they please." In answer to this, we are told:—

"Very true; yet these doctrines are collectively called 'Theosophy.' What is your explanation of this?"

We reply:—"To call them so is a 'collective' mistake; one of those loose applications of terms to things that ought to be more carefully defined; and the neglect of members to do so is now bearing its fruits. In fact it is an oversight as harmful as that which followed the confusion of the two terms 'buddhism' and 'bodhism,' leading the Wisdom philosophy to be mistaken for the religion of Buddha."

But it is still urged that when these doctrines are examined it becomes very clear that all the work which the Society as a body

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for October, 1889.

has done in the East and the West depended upon them. This is obviously true in the case of the doctrine of the underlying unity of all religions and the existence, as claimed by Theosophists, of a common source called the Wisdom-religion of the secret teaching, from which, according to the same claims, all existing forms of religion are directly or indirectly derived. Admitting this, we are pressed to explain, how can the T. S. as a body be said to have no special views or doctrines to inculcate, no creed and no dogmas, when these are "the back-bone of the Society, its very heart and soul"?

To this we can only answer that it is still another error. That these teachings are most undeniably the "back-bone of the Theosophical Societies *in the West,* but not at all in the East, where such Branch Societies number almost five to one in the West. Were these special doctrines the "heart and soul" of the whole body, then Theosophy and its T. S. would have died out in India and Ceylon since 1885—and this is surely not the case. For, not only have they been virtually abandoned at Adyar since that year, as there was no one to teach them, but while some Brahmin Theosophists were very much opposed to that teaching being made public, others —the more orthodox—positively opposed them as being inimical to their exoteric systems.

These are self-evident facts. And yet if answered that it is not so; that the T. S. as a body teaches no special religion but tolerates and virtually accepts all religions by never interfering with, or even inquiring after the religious views of its members, our cavillers and even friendly opponents, do not feel satisfied. On the contrary: ten to one they will non-plus you with the following extraordinary objection:—

"How can this be, since belief in 'Esoteric Buddhism' is a *sine qua non* for acceptance as a Fellow of your Society?"

It is vain to protest any longer; useless, to assure our opponents that belief in *Buddhism,* whether esoteric or exoteric, is no more expected by, nor obligatory in, our Society than reverence for the monkey-god Hanuman, him of the singed tail, or belief in Mahomet and his canonized mare. It is unprofitable to try and explain that since there are in the T. S. as many Brahmins, Mussulmans, Parsis, Jews and Christians as there are Buddhists, and more, all cannot be expected to become followers of Buddha, nor even of Buddhism, howsoever esoteric. Nor can they be made to realize that the Occult doctrines—a few fundamental teachings of which are broadly outlined in Mr. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism"—are not the *whole* of Theosophy, nor even the whole of the secret doctrines of the East, but a very small portion of these: Occultism itself being but one of the Sciences of Theosophy, or the WISDOM-Religion, and by no means the whole of THEOSOPHY.

So firmly rooted seem these ideas, however, in the mind of the average Britisher, that it is like telling him that there are Russians

who are neither Nihilists nor Panslavists, and that every Frenchman does not make his daily meal of frogs; he will simply refuse to believe you. Prejudice against Theosophy seems to have become part of the national feeling. For almost three years the writer of the present—helped in this by a host of Theosophists—has tried in vain to sweep away from the public brain some of the most fantastic cobwebs with which it is garnished; and now she is on the eve of giving up the attempt in despair! While half of the English people will persist in confusing Theosophy with "esoteric *Bud-ism*," the remainder will keep on pronouncing the world-honoured title of Buddha as they do—*butter*.

It is they also who have started the proposition now generally adopted by the flippant press that "Theosophy is not a philosophy, but a religion," and "a new sect."

Theosophy is certainly not a philosophy, simply because it includes every philosophy as every science and religion. But before we prove it once more, it may be pertinent to ask how many of our critics are thoroughly posted about, say, even the true definition of the term coined by Pythagoras, that they should so flippantly deny it to a system of which they seem to know still less than they do about philosophy? Have they acquainted themselves with its best and latest definitions, or even with the views upon it, now regarded as antiquated, of Sir W. Hamilton? The answer would seem to be in the negative, since they fail to see that every such definition shows Theosophy to be the very synthesis of Philosophy in its widest abstract sense, as in its special qualifications. Let us try to give once more a clear and concise definition of Theosophy, and show it to be the very root and essence of all sciences and systems.

Theosophy is "divine" or "god-wisdom." Therefore, it must be the life-blood of that system (philosophy) which is defined as "the science of things divine and human and the causes in which they are contained" *(Sir W. Hamilton)*, Theosophy alone possessing the keys to those "causes." Bearing in mind simply its most elementary division, we find that philosophy is the love of, and search after wisdom, "the knowledge of phenomena as explained by, and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers and laws." *(Encyclopedia.)* When applied to god or gods, it became in every country *theology;* when to material nature, it was called *physics* and *natural history;* concerned with man, it appeared as *anthropology* and *psychology;* and when raised to the higher regions it becomes known as *metaphysics*. Such is philosophy—"the science of effects by their causes"—the very spirit of the doctrine of *Karma*, the most important teaching under various names of every religious philosophy, and a theosophical tenet that belongs to no one religion but explains them all. Philosophy is also called "the science of things possible, inasmuch as they are possible." This applies directly to theosophical doctrines, inasmuch as they reject *miracle;* but it can hardly apply to theology or any dogmatic religion, every one of

which *enforces belief in things impossible;* nor to the modern philosophical systems of the materialists who reject even the "possible," whenever the latter contradicts their assertions.

Theosophy claims to explain and to reconcile religion with science. We find G. H. Lewes *(History of Philosophy*, vol. I., Prolegomena, p. xviii.) stating that "Philosophy, detaching its widest conceptions from both (Theology and Science), furnishes a doctrine which contains an *explanation of the world and human destiny.*" "The office of Philosophy is the systematisation of the conceptions furnished by Science. . . . Science furnishes the knowledge, and Philosophy the doctrine" *(loc. cit.)*. The latter can become complete only on condition of having that "knowledge" and that "doctrine" passed through the sieve of Divine Wisdom, or Theosophy.

Ueberweg (History of Philosophy) defines Philosophy as "the Science of Principles," which, as all our members know, is the claim of Theosophy in its branch-sciences of Alchemy, Astrology, and the occult sciences generally.

Hegel regards it as "the contemplation of the self-development of the ABSOLUTE," or in other words as "the representation of the Idea" *(Darstellung der Idee)*.

The whole of the Secret Doctrine—of which the work bearing that name is but an atom—is such a contemplation and record, as far as finite language and limited thought can record the processes of the infinite.

Thus it becomes evident that Theosophy cannot be a "religion," still less "a sect," but it is indeed the quintessence of the highest *philosophy* in all and every one of its aspects. Having shown that it falls under, and answers fully, every description of philosophy, we may add to the above a few more of Sir W. Hamilton's definitions, and prove our statement by showing the pursuit of the same in Theosophical literature. This is a task easy enough, indeed. For, does not "Theosophy" include "the science of things evidently deduced from first principles," as well as "the sciences of truths sensible and abstract"? Does it not preach "the applications of reason to its legitimate objects," and make it one of its "legitimate objects"—to inquire into "the science of the original form of the Ego, or mental self," as also to teach the secret of "the absolute indifference of the ideal and real"? All of which proves that according to every definition—old or new—of philosophy, he who studies Theosophy, studies *the highest transcendental philosophy*.

We need not go out of our way to notice at any length such foolish statements about Theosophy and Theosophists as are found almost daily in the public press. Such definitions and epithets as "new fangled religion" and "ism," "the system *invented* by the high priestess of Theosophy," and other remarks as silly, may be left to their own fate. They have been and in most cases will be left unnoticed.

Our age is regarded as being pre-eminently critical: an age which analyses closely, and whose public refuses to accept anything offered for its consideration before it has fully scrutinized the subject. Such is the boast of our century; but such is not quite the opinion of the impartial observer. At all events it is an opinion highly exaggerated since this boasted analytical scrutiny is applied only to that which interferes in no way with national, social, or personal prejudices. On the other hand everything that is malevolent, destructive to reputation, wicked and slanderous, is received with open embrace, accepted joyfully, and made the subject of everlasting public gossip, without any scrutiny or the slightest hesitation, but verily on a blind faith of the most elastic kind. We challenge contradiction on this point. Neither unpopular characters nor their work are judged in our day on their intrinsic value, but merely on their author's personality and the prejudiced opinion thereon of the masses. In many journals no literary work of a Theosophist can ever hope to be reviewed on its own merits, apart from the gossip about its author. Such papers, oblivious of the rule first laid down by Aristotle, who says that criticism is "a standard of judging well," refuse point blank to accept any Theosophical book apart from its writer. As a first result, the former is judged by the distorted reflection of the latter created by slander repeated in the daily papers. The personality of the writer hangs like a dark shadow between the opinion of the modern journalist and unvarnished truth; and as a final result there are few editors in all Europe and America who know anything of our Society's tenets.

How can then Theosophy or even the T. S. be correctly judged? It is nothing new to say that the true critic ought to know something at least of the subject he undertakes to analyse. Nor is it very risky to add that not one of our press Thersites knows in the remotest way what he is talking about—this, from the large fish to the smallest fry;* but whenever the word "Theosophy" is printed and catches the reader's eye, there it will be generally found preceded and followed by abusive epithets and invective against the personalities of certain Theosophists. The modern editor of the Grundy pandering kind, is like Byron's hero, *"He knew not what to say, and so he swore"*—at that which passeth his comprehension. All such swearing is invariably based upon old gossip, and stale denunciations of those who stand in the moon-struck minds as the "inventors" of Theosophy. Had South Sea islanders a daily press of their own, they would be as sure to accuse the missionaries of having invented Christianity in order to bring to grief their native fetishism.

How long, O radiant gods of truth, how long shall this terrible mental cecity of the nineteenth century *Philosophists* last? How

*From Jupiter Tonans of the *Saturday Review* down to the scurrilous editor of the *Mirror*. The first may be as claimed one of the greatest authorities living on *fencing*, and the other as great at "muscular" thought reading, yet both are equally ignorant of Theosophy and as blind to its real object and purposes as two owls are to day-light.

much longer are they to be told that Theosophy is no national property, no religion, but only the universal code of science and the most transcendental ethics that was ever known; that it lies at the root of every moral philosophy and religion; and that neither Theosophy *per se,* nor yet its humble unworthy vehicle, the Theosophical Society, has anything whatever to do with any personality or personalities! To identify it with these is to show oneself sadly defective in logic and even common sense. To reject the teaching and its philosophy under the pretext that its leaders, or rather one of its Founders, lies under various accusations (so far unproven) is silly, illogical and absurd. It is, in truth, as ridiculous as it would have been in the days of the Alexandrian school of Neo-Platonism, which was in its essence *Theosophy,* to reject its teachings, because it came to Plato from Socrates, and because the sage of Athens, besides his pug-nose and bald head, was accused of "blasphemy and of corrupting the youth."

Aye, kind and generous critics, who call yourselves Christians, and boast of the civilisation and progress of your age; you have only to be scratched skin deep to find in you the same cruel and prejudiced "barbarian" as of old. Were an opportunity offered you to sit in public and legal judgment on a Theosophist, who of you would rise in your nineteenth century of Christianity higher than one of the Athenian *dikastery* with its 500 jurors who condemned Socrates to death? Which of you would scorn to become a Meletus or an Anytus, and have Theosophy and all its adherents condemned on the evidence of false witness to a like ignominious death? The hatred manifested in your daily attacks upon the Theosophists is a warrant to us for this. Did Haywood have you in his mind's eye when he wrote of Society's censure:—

> "O! that the too censorious world would learn
> This wholesome rule, and with each other bear;
> But man, as if a foe to his own species,
> Takes pleasure to report his neighbour's faults,
> Judging with rigour every small offence,
> And prides himself in scandal. . . . "

Many optimistic writers would fain make of this mercantile century of ours an age of philosophy and call it its *renaissance.* We fail to find outside of our Society any attempt at philosophical revival, unless the word "philosophy" is made to lose its original meaning. For wherever we turn we find a cold sneer at true philosophy. A sceptic can never aspire to that title. He who is capable of imagining the universe with its handmaiden Nature fortuitous, and hatched like the black hen of the fable, out of a self-created egg hanging in space, has neither the power of thinking nor the spiritual faculty of perceiving abstract truths; which power and faculty are the first requisites of a philosophical mind. We see the entire realm of modern Science honeycombed with such materialists,

who yet claim to be regarded as philosophers. They either believe in naught as do the Secularists, or doubt according to the manner of the Agnostics. Remembering the two wise aphorisms by Bacon, the modern-day materialist is thus condemned out of the mouth of the Founder of his own inductive method, as contrasted with the deductive philosophy of Plato, accepted in Theosophy. For does not Bacon tell us that "Philosophy *when superficially studied* excites doubt; when thoroughly explored it dispels it;" and again, "a *little* philosophy *inclineth man's mind to atheism;* but depth of philosophy bringeth man's mind about to religion"?

The logical deduction of the above is, undeniably, that none of our present Darwinians and materialists and their admirers, our critics, could have studied philosophy otherwise than very "superficially." Hence while Theosophists have a legitimate right to the title of *philosophers*—true "lovers of Wisdom"—their critics and slanderers are at best Philosophicules—the progeny of modern Philosophism.

---

# CHRISTIAN SCIENCE*[1]

THE object of this work, which is published in the form of twelve pamphlets, each averaging about twenty pages in length, is to prepare the reader for becoming a student of the Science of Healing by means of the Spirit, for this title (though somewhat lengthy) more accurately describes the so-called Science than the cognomen "Christian." "Prepare the reader," is also said advisedly; for the first ten of these pamphlets are chiefly occupied with the thesis that man's beliefs with regard to the existence of matter being erroneous, he is thereby subject to certain illusions with regard to it, the chief of these being ill-health and disease. This is pure Berkeleyan philosophy, if not Platonism itself; Theosophists indeed, may claim for it a far older origin, for does not the early Brahmanic and Buddhist philosophies teach that all outward appearances, all phenomena, are illusion—Maya? However this may be, the application of the principle to the treatment of disease, if not actually new, is here presented to us in a novel form, and with a view to rendering its practice popular. It is philosophy reduced to its simplest expression. It is the physician's highest art made common property. It is another claim to a "secret unveiled," the secret of man's being. And if, as the writer states, the present treatment of disease is the result of man's belief in the

---

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for July, 1888.

[1] Statements of Christian Science. *Comprised in eighteen lessons, and twelve sections.* By Ursula N. Gestefeld. Chicago, 1888.

reality of matter, it is doubtless necessary to begin by a somewhat lengthy chain of reasoning in order to convince him of his error, for man cannot understand what he really is so long as he pronounces upon himself as he sees only. "Not until he brings his higher powers into action, his discernment and perception, will he begin to perceive the truth about himself, which stands opposed to his own belief of himself. And never till he so perceives and understands will he reverse his decision upon himself. And never till he reverses it, will he grow into the consciousness of what he really is."[2] He will remain, as the author puts it, in the Adam-state, subject to the law of matter, making to himself "graven images," and falling down and worshipping them. And as "Adam is the model of man as we see and know him to-day, Jesus is the model of what he is to become—consciously, as he is in reality—through his own work of regeneration and redemption." . . . "It was this consciousness which was perfect realization, which gave him (Jesus) the power he manifested over sin, sickness and death, by which he healed the halt, the sick and the blind; by which he cast out devils and raised the dead."[3] This consciousness is the chief point insisted upon in this stage of the work, for until this is realized, there is no possibility of the exercise of the healer's power, except perhaps in a weak or partial manner. It is not therefore till we arrive at Section X. that the treatment of disease is actually touched upon. In this section we are told that "what man in his ignorance calls health is as much a belief as what he calls sickness," and that "putting medicine into a stomach never yet changed a man's conception of himself; but he has changed one conception or belief of his for another in consequence of his belief in the power of the medicine." Conditions of ill-health are said to be nothing "but mental pictures which man creates for himself and believes in religiously." We must therefore learn to dominate all those conditions to which we believe our bodies to be subject. Denial of the false, affirmation of the true, constantly in thought if not in word, is to be the first process for bringing about a change in man's own body first, subsequently in that of others. If we deny sickness and suffering and all kinds of evil as no-things, non-existent, not proceeding from the Infinite Mind, both as regards ourselves and all surrounding us, for all are parts of one Universal Whole (which is another purely Vedanto-Buddhistic tenet), we shall, by this transformation of the inward gradually act upon and cause a transformation of the outward, and overcome all discordant conditions, be they called sin, or suffering, or sickness. And as man is the creator of every form of sin and suffering, so is he also the transmitter of these through "Thought Transference"; diseases are communicated by this means "instead of through physical germs."* The healer by means of "Christian Science" must attack the root of all disease,

[2] Section III. p. 18.
[3] Section VIII. p. 6.
* Section XI. p. 12.

man's belief about himself and others; he must treat the sufferer for his faults and for sin, of which his diseases are but the extreme expression, one disease being the same as another to a scientific healer. In treating little children, it is mainly the parents who have to be dealt with, their beliefs about the child, their fear and their anxiety.

The last section closes with some instructions as to the attitude and deportment of the healer towards his patient, but the whole treatment is to be spiritual, above and beyond the plane of material being.

Such is an imperfect digest of the teaching contained in Mrs. Gestefeld's twelve pamphlets. A candidate for "Christian Science" would have to study them in all their details; for it is only by dwelling and meditating on the principles therein set forth that one can arrive at the state of mind necessary for realizing the results to be attained. The Science of Being can be summed up in few words, but it cannot be so easily imparted, and many difficulties naturally occur to the student which require to be separately answered. A few of these must be stated at the outset.

To begin with, why premise by giving to a Science a qualification which does not belong to it? Why start with a *misnomer?* Why call it "Christian" rather than "Sufic," "Buddhist," or better than all, the "Yoga Science," the aim of which is preeminently to attain union with the Universal Spirit? We are told by the author, as also by several other professors of this new school, that it was through this *Science* that Jesus healed, and that it was this Science which he taught. We demur to the statement. There is nothing whatever in the New Testament to lead to such an idea or even suspicion; and there are no other documents known more authoritative to the Christians than the Gospels. The Sermon on the Mount, which is the very embodiment of Christ's teachings—Christianity in a nut-shell, so to say—is a code of preeminently *practical* as also impracticable rules of life, of daily observances, yet all on the plane of matter-of-fact earth-life. When you are told to turn your left cheek to him who smites you on the right, you are not commanded to *deny* the blow, but on the contrary to assert it by meekly bearing the offence; and in order not *to resist evil,* to turn (whether metaphorically or otherwise) your other cheek—*i. e.,* to invite your offender to repeat the action.

Again, when your "Son," or brother, or neighbour, asks of you bread, you are not invited to *deny* the hunger of him who asks, but to give him food; as otherwise you would indeed give him instead of fish "a serpent." Finally, sins, wickedness, diseases, etc., are not *denied* by Jesus, nor are their opposites, virtue, goodness and health, anywhere *affirmed.* Otherwise, where would be the *raison d'être* for his alleged coming to save the world from the original sin? We know that "Christian Scientists" deny every the-

ological dogma, from Eden downwards, as much as we do. Yet they affirm that which Jesus ever practically denied; and affirming (is it for the sake, and in view of the Christian majority in their audiences?), they are not in union with the Universal Spirit, which is—TRUTH.

Again, is it safe to entrust this occult power (for such it surely is) to the hands of the multitude? Did not Jesus, whom we are expressly told to take as our model, himself say:—"To you (who are disciples, initiates) it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven; but to others in parables"? Is there no danger that one who acquires this power of controlling the will and thoughts of others, and the conditions surrounding them, should fall from his high estate, and use his influence for bad purposes—in other words, that the *white* magic should become *black?* The very fact that Mrs. Gestefeld warns the healer never to give a treatment for any purpose but to make the Truth of Being manifest, "never for any personal gain," points to this possibility; she also warns, or I may say threatens, that if this should be attempted, the would-be healer will "descend at once to the plane of mortal mind." Perhaps this implies that the power will depart from him, but that this salutary consequence will accrue is scarcely made clear to the reader. She says, indeed, "You will be no Christian Scientist, but a mesmerist." But to certain people this would be no objection. Where then is the guarantee, the hall-mark, of the true Christian Scientist, by which he can be known to the unwary? If this, like other spiritual things, can only be "spiritually discerned," the patient must be equal to the healer, and will have no need of him.

Again, is it true that all our diseases are the result of wrong beliefs? The child, who has no belief, no knowledge or conception, true or false, on the subject of disease, catches scarlet fever through the transference of germs, not through that of thought. One is tempted to ask, like those of old, did the child sin or his parents? Will the answer of the Great Healer fit the case, *i. e.*, "Neither did this child sin nor his parents, but that the glory of God might be made manifest"? The "glory of the new *Christian* Science," then?—the "new" wine in very, very old bottles? And are there not among the renowned teachers of the new science, who are themselves afflicted by disease, often incurable, by pain and suffering? Will Mrs. Gestefeld, or some one nearer home, explain?

Then further, in the case of widespread epidemics, such as cholera, we know that to a certain extent these are the consequence of man's sin, his neglect of hygienic laws, of cleanliness and good drainage, and, in proportion as these laws are obeyed, to a certain extent preventable. But there are also climatic conditions, as in the last visitation of cholera in 1884, when the epidemic seemed confined to certain areas, following some law of atmospheric currents, or other undetected, but not undiscoverable, physical cause. Can these

be overcome by Christian Science? How is it they do not yield to a whole nation's fervent prayers?—for prayer, when in earnest, is surely, at least, when accompanied by virtuous living, a *mode* of Christian Science, of intense Will? And do we not see the holiest and the best, and those, too, not living in ignorance or in defiance of law spiritual, moral, mental, or hygienic, fall victims to disease, and only able to preserve life at all with the utmost, almost abnormal, care and precaution?

But "Christian Science" goes further than that. At a lecture, in London, it was distinctly asserted that every physical disease arises from, and is the direct effect of, a mental disease or vice: *e. g.*, "Bright's disease of the kidneys is always produced in persons who are untruthful, and who practise deception." Query, Would not, in this case, the whole black fraternity of Loyola, every diplomat, advocate and lawyer, as the majority of tradesmen and merchants, be incurably afflicted with this terrible evil? Shall we be next told that cancer on the tongue or in the throat is produced by those who backbite and slander their fellow men? It would be well-deserved Karma, were it so. Unfortunately, some recent cases of this dreadful disease, carrying off two of the best, most noble-hearted and truthful men living, would give a glaring denial to such an assertion.

"Christian" (or mental) *Scientists* assert, furthermore, that the healer can work on a patient (even one whom he has never seen) as easily thousands of miles away, as a few yards off. Were this so, and the practice to become universal, it would hardly be a pleasant thing to know that wherever one might be, occult currents are directed towards one from unknown well-wishers at a distance, whether one wants them or not. If, on the one hand, it is rather agreeable, and even useful, in this age of slander to have other people *denying* your faults and vices, and thus saving you from telling lies yourself; on the other hand, it would cut from under one's feet every possibility of amending one's nature through personal exertion, and would deprive one at the same time of every personal merit in the matter. Karma would hardly be satisfied with such an easy arrangement.

This world would witness strange sights and the next one (a reincarnationist would say "the next rebirth,") terrible disappointments. Whether viewed from the standpoint of theists, Christians, or the followers of Eastern philosophy, such an arrangement would satisfy very few minds. Disease, mental characteristics and shortcomings, are always effects produced by causes: the natural effect of Karma, the unerring Law of Retribution, as we would say; and one gets into a curious jumble when trying to work along certain given lines of this "Christian Science" theory. Will its teachers give us more definite statements as to the general workings of their theories?

In conclusion, were these theories to prove true, their practice would only be our old friend magnetism, or *hypnotism* rather, with all its undeniable dangers, only on a gigantic universal scale; hence a thousand times more dangerous for the human family at large, than is the former. For no magnetizer can work upon a person whom he has never seen or come in contact with—and this is one blessing, at any rate. And this is not the case with mental or "Christian" Science, since we are distinctly told that we can work on perfect strangers, those we *have never met,* and who are thousands of miles away from us. In such case, and as a first benefit, our civilized centres would do well to have their clergy and Christian communities learn the "Science." This would save millions of pounds sterling now scraped off the bones of the starving multitudes and sunk into the insatiable digestive organs of missionary funds. Missionaries, in fact, would become useless—and this would become blessing number two. For henceforth they would have but to meet in small groups and send off currents of Will beyond the "black waters" to obtain all they are striving for. Let them *deny* that the heathens are not Christians, and *affirm* that they are baptized, even without contact. Thus the whole world would be saved, and private capital likewise.

Of course it may so happen that our "heathen" brethren who have had the now called "Christian" science at their finger ends ever since the days of Kapila and Patanjili, may take it into their head to reverse the current and set it in motion in an opposite direction. They may *deny* in their turn that their Christian persecutors have one iota of Christianity in them. They may *affirm* that the whole of Christendom is eaten through to the backbone with diseases resulting from the seven capital sins; that millions drink themselves to death and other millions (governments included) force them to do so by building two public houses to every church, a fact which even a Christian Scientist could hardly make way with if he denied it till the next pralaya. Thus the heathen would have an advantage over the Christian Scientist in his denials and affirmations, inasmuch as he would only be telling the truth; while, by denying disease and evil, his Western colleague is simply flying into the face of fact and encouraging the unwary mystic to *ignore* instead of *killing* his sinful nature.

The present criticism may be a mistaken one, and we may have misunderstood the "Science" under analysis, in which, however, we recognise a very old acquaintance, namely, Dhyâna, "abstract meditation." But so much the greater the necessity for a definite explanation. For these are questions we would fain have answered, precisely in the interest of that *old* Science reborn under a new mask, and because it must be the desire of every true follower of Eastern Theosophy to see the doctrine of self-oblivion and altruism, as against selfishness and personality, more widely understood and practised than at present.

# ON THE LOOKOUT

The published books and magazine writings of H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge were pioneer work. They cleared the field of thought of the growth and rubbish of twenty centuries of accumulation, and furnished the soil and the seed for a new basis of thinking—a new harvest of ideas. Of the mass of literature theosophical that has been produced by students in the last quarter of a century, by far the greater part has been speculative and empirical, not to say charlatanesque. This was inevitable and marked the second step of all new cultivation—the old seeds and the old weeds springing up avidly with the new in the freshly ploughed soil. But the real students of the philosophy have never been deceived and as time goes on truer uses are being made of the *material* provided by the great Teachers. The most recent attempt at practical embodiment of some of the applications of Theosophy to daily life, and one marked by entire simplicity and sincerity of purpose, is to be found in the book just published by "THEOSOPHY" and entitled "Because—For the Children Who Ask Why." The essence of any faith or philosophy must rest in its capacity for survival, which is only an abstraction, a formula, for saying that the power of virility is that of self-reproduction. Crusted with the mold of mind of the civilization in which we dwell, adult Theosophists are fatally prone to running their train of Theosophical thought on the narrow track of inherited and acquired tendencies and so make of their lives one thing and of their "theosophy" a something separate. "Because—" is for older Theosophists no less than for children. Indeed, it is primarily for parents and of necessity only secondarily for their children since the latter can only be reached through and *by* the former. The book is bare of verbal adornments and begins at once to answer the spoken and unspoken questions of childhood as to death, as to life, as to God, as to man, as to "things"—all in the way of the story of the experiences and enquiries of two children, who might be—and are—your children and mine. The book is tentative and you feel your way through it, just as do the two children, and just as does the Aunt who always talks with the girl and the boy, and never to them. To the lay mind and the lay parent the subjects mentioned sound formidable and impossible of explanation to the small questioner. This is because we Theosophists constantly forget that the Ego in the child body is not infantile and so stand far off from the fact as from the "child." For parents the book is of great value because it is suggestive and exemplary. It points the way and travels some small part of it hand in hand with parent and child. It marks a point of beginning for the instilling of true ideas into the plastic brain, and a line of direction that can be followed indefinitely as the open mind of the child expands. The book is direct, devoid of cant and does not "dodge." It is not too much to say that its tone has the very candor, the quaint abruptness, of the children for whose help it is written. Sincere Theosophists can but appreciate the reverence, the dignity and clearness undercurrent in the preface and in the text. The pollen of feeling has not been rubbed off in artifice of speech. The book may be had from the Business Agent of "THEOSOPHY." Price, $1.00, postpaid.

---

The Hearst newspapers with their usual seventh day advent of syndicated science have discovered the true explanation of the memory of familiarity with scenes unknown to the observer, which has often been adduced as an evidence of pre-existence. The explanation is quoted from a book written by a Catholic priest, and recites that occasionally one of the occipital lobes of the brain, "which control visual memory," becomes temporarily dormant, and then perception is by the other lobe alone. As the

two lobes even in a normal cerebellum can, "we know, act quite independently of each other," all that is needful is to assume that the temporarily obscured organ wakes up to activity, and the resultant duality of perception gives rise to the illusion of pre-existent memory. We recall having read precisely the same sapient explanation and assumption—or rather, in these scientific coruscations the assumption precedes the explanation—in Chambers' Encyclopedia, edition of 1880, only there, the "scientific" explanation had the whole matter referred to the two hemispheres of the cerebrum. Later empiricism having discovered that in the ordinary human brain one-half of the cerebrum is never used, the explanation fell by the wayside. When it is "discovered" later on that the cerebellum as such has nothing whatever to do with "visual memory," there will doubtless be forthcoming a new scientific explanation of the phenomenon of remembering what one has never seen. A naive confessional paragraph in the article, which is entitled, "Why we sometimes seem to have lived before," reads as follows:

"The theory of pre-existence is, however, incompatible with the teachings of Christianity, and therefore some other explanation of the recognized phenomena we are considering is welcomed by the Church."

It is worth while to repeat what is well-known to all students with even a casual acquaintance with early Christian history, to wit, that pre-existence was a belief entertained by the majority of the Jews, is implicit in the recorded sayings of Christ, was taught and upheld as a truth as well as a doctrine by most of the early Church fathers and was integral with the other tenets common to the scattered congregations till the Council of Constantinople, in the sixth century, A. D. Its anathema and subsequent disappearance from dogmatic Christianity was due, not to anything Jesus taught, but to the conspiracy between Constantine and Eusebius, the one avid for temporal, as the other was for ecclesiastical, power and prerogative. Perhaps the Sunday writers for the Hearst newspapers could also make the necessary assumptions to explain scientifically why it is that the western race mind is turning increasingly to the soul-satisfying teaching of reincarnation as the only possible explanation consistent with the facts of experience, however "incompatible" with present day theological dogmas.

---

"Bonjour, Monsieur!" in *Harper's* for September is, in its way, almost as good an illustration of inverted psychology as the attempt to explain the idea of pre-existence by deranged occipital functioning. Mr. Stephen Potter, finding himself on the edge of nervous breakdown, despite a life-long disbelief in "nerves," goes forth from the room he has lived in for twelve years without ever being consciously aware of its arrangements in furnishings, and betakes himself to the south of France. It is his first trip abroad, yet none the less he finds a street in a little town that is wholly familiar to him. More than that, he finds himself perforce expectant to see a young girl in a red skirt and picturesque high-peaked bonnet, standing on the steps in front of one of the houses. She is not there, but the insistent feeling that she *must* be there haunts him even more than the bewildering familiarity of the street itself. He seeks explanation in his "nerves." It won't serve. Reincarnation, it appears, he may have heard of, but if so, "it had remained in his mind a wholly subjective memory, one which failed to make itself felt objectively now except as a vague and uneasy foreboding that there were things in the world not dreamed of in his philosophy." Finally, after four or five wrenching days—the girl appears on the steps! He rushes to her with questions in English. The chauffeur appears. Explanations of Mr. Potter's disconcerting behaviour are in order. Mr. Potter tells his chauffeur of his mental predicament and the only help the driver can offer is that his employer is victim of an hallucination—"unless, to be sure, Monsieur believes in reincarnation." "A moment passed tensely in silence, then, 'I'm not a crook,'

said Mr. Potter." Eventually Mr. Potter finds himself back in New York, in his old room. There he happens to observe a print upon the wall. Denouement! The print is a picture of a street in a provincial town and on the stoop before the house the girl, red skirt and all.

It might be suggested that the author of "Bonjour, Monsieur!" has in fact smothered a bright idea for a strong story in the blanket of a too conventional imagination. As a fantasy, the print is wholly unromantic, and as an explanation of the events pictured in the story, its psychology is wholly unconvincing and therefore wholly unsatisfactory. In the story it is made to appear that the girl of the illusion was the grandmother of the damsel who appeared before the startled but expectant Mr. Potter. How much more artistic if the author had furnished Mr. Potter with a Gallic name and had it that his grandfather had been reared "somewhere in France," and left us with the suggested idea of hallucination or reincarnation as the explanation of the facts. In that case who would have preferred hallucination? The writer of "Bonjour, Monsieur!" is evidently not familiar with the phrase of E. A. Poe, past master of all mysteries in fiction—"mystery stories should be matter of fact in recital. It is the fine art of illusion. But beware of the anticlimax of a prosaic unraveling." The story is more than a story, though, to Theosophists for they know that a scant generation ago, the idea of reincarnation would have been altogether taboo in a story for *Harper's,* even from the lips of an humble chauffeur—as taboo and as unheard of as the word chauffeur.

---

Sir Oliver Lodge has written a newspaper article upon survival after death and affirming his own experimental certainty of communication with the departed. Answering his own postulated question as to how he "knows so positively that death is not the end," Sir Oliver Lodge says:

> Not by religion, not by faith, have I been guided to this knowledge. . . . The power of thought, the immaterial method of communication called telepathy continues and this can be utilized and developed. By its means messages have been received across the gulf and the barrier is opaque no longer."

Sir Oliver was formerly President of the Society for Psychical Research and has been a Christian Spiritualist for many years. Like Prof. Crookes, Camille Flammarion, W. T. Stead and many other well-known men of science and of letters, Mr. Lodge has discarded the belief in the omnipotence of "matter" once so prevalent as to form the unwritten law among scientists. His numerous books and other writings for a decade and more have evidenced a pathetic effort to put the new wine of a wider hope into the old bottles of religious dogmatism and scientific experimentation in things metaphysical by methods physical. This is the morass into which has floundered every scientist, every psychical researcher and every experimenter in hypnotism, mesmerism, new thought, Christian Scientist, etc., of whom we have any public record. Their efforts represent the practice consequent upon the danger of the time, and which was warned against so many times by H. P. Blavatsky, and which she characterized in 1888 as follows:

> "For by 'materialism' is meant an anti-philosophical negation of pure spirit . . . which has led many, after a denial of all existence other than in matter, into a blind belief in the *materialization of Spirit.*"

Modern spiritualism, psychism in all its allurements, religious and otherwise, is just that—a blind belief in the materialization of Spirit. Just as the ignorance and the passions of humanity have anthropomorphized the spiritual ideas of the past and so made at best but *cul de sacs* of all the once great religions, so the impulse imparted by the nineteenth century effort of

the Great Lodge has not awakened spirituality in men. It has only set them dreaming. Some of the dreams are pleasant and some filled with horrors, present and to come. Much part of what is now offered as Theosophy is but a painted spiritism, a pseudo-psychism whose path and whose destination for its votaries is all that Masters have written against.

Let one endeavor to imagine Buddha or Christ teaching as spiritually efficacious the methods so assiduously cultivated by spiritualists and psychists, and as preaching the salvation of the world through séances with Mrs. Piper, Eusepia Palladino, the "circles" and sessions with mediums and "subjects," Prof. Lodge and many others! The practices employed are worse than any vivisection for they have to do with something infinitely more sensitive and valuable than any body—they are the maiming of the inner man of both subject and operator, and have been unsparingly denounced by the great spiritual teachers of all time.

Mr. Lodge concludes his article by saying:

> "Some there are now
> tions from the dead) and
> bridges the chasm.'"

We may grant the sincerity
but it would be interesting to lear
bridges the chasm, and to what
facilitated by the revival of these
by back door routes. Do séance
sitters? Does hypnotism tend to
Would any of the countless expe
change places with his "subject"
mental, moral and psychical inves
diligently in the endeavor t
futility of left hand magic for
in 1876 in a single phrase—"medi
Lodge, like many others of his
Theosophy. H. P. B.'s occultism is devoted to the well being of "that great orphan—Humanity," and has in it nothing inviting to those, whatever their rank or station in life, who seek knowledge and power for themselves, and therefore see nothing impossible or even incongruous, in seeking entrance into the domain of spirit with the tools of their calling.

Job 2565 for.....
Mend by.....Time 1-26-10 4.0
[Unusual mending time charged extra] .....
Stab by.....No. Sect 19B Sew by.....
Before sewing, Score V Press....Strip Sect....
[Scoring is necessary on stiff or heavy paper]
Rate .....
This book bound by Pacific Library Binding Company, Los Angeles, specialists in Library Binding. Work and materials furnished are guaranteed to wear indefinitely to satisfaction of purchaser, and any defects appearing in either will be made good without additional charge. "Bound to wear."